AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of October 2, 2013 Meeting Minutes

3. Communications

4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)


6. Resolution TPB No. 81 Regarding Agreement for Specialized Transportation Coordination Services With Dane County in 2014

7. Resolution TPB No. 82 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter Into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) to Provide Transportation Planning Work Activities to CARPC in 2014

8. Resolution TPB No. 83 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter Into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for CARPC to Provide Population and Employment Forecasting Services Utilizing Pass-Through Funding from WisDOT

9. Resolution TPB No. 84 Supporting Metro Transit as the Designated Recipient of Funding for the Federal Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program for the Madison Urbanized Area

10. Continued Discussion and Possible Decision Item: Recommendation Regarding Potential Revision to MPO Board Structure and Membership Due to Expanded Metropolitan Planning Area and New Public Transportation Provider Representative Requirement

11. Letter of Comment on Draft Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement on the Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Planning and Environmental Linkages Corridor Study Process

12. Report on Update of the Roadway Functional Classification Map

13. Update on Transportation Alternatives Program Application Cycle for 2014-2018 Projects

14. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects Involving the TPB:
   - USH 51/Stoughton Road (USH 12/18 to IH 39/90/94) Corridor EIS Study
   - USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor EIS Study
   - Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Corridor EIS Study
   - Interstate 39/90/94 (Madison to Wisconsin Dells) Corridor EIS Study

15. Discussion of Future Work Items:
   - Section 5310 Program Management Plan
   - Metro Bus Size Study
   - Public Participation Plan Update
   - Roadway Functional Classification Update
   - Consideration of Revision to Structure of MPO Board
• Transportation Alternatives Program Application Cycle for 2014-2018 Projects
• Bicycle Transportation Plan Update

16. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

17. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

**Wednesday, December 4 at 7 p.m.**
Madison Water Utility Building, 119 E. Olin Ave., Room A-B

If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this meeting, contact the Planning & Development Dept. at (608) 266-4635 or TTY/TEXTNET (866) 704-2318.

Please do so at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so that proper arrangements can be made.

Si Ud. necesita un intérprete, materiales en formatos alternos, o acomodaciones para poder venir a esta reunión, por favor haga contacto con el Department of Planning & Development (el departamento de planificación y desarrollo) al (608)-266-4635, o TTY/TEXTNET (886)-704-2318.

Por favor avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.
1. Roll Call

Members present: David Ahrens, Judd Blau, Mark Clear, Jeff Gust, Chuck Kamp, Steve King, Jerry Mandli (arrived during item #4), Al Matano, Ed Minihan, Mark Opitz, Chris Schmidt (arrived during item #5), Robin Schmidt (arrived during item #5)

Members absent: Ken Golden, Paul Lawrence

MPO Staff present: Bill Schaefer, Mike Cechvala

2. Approval of September 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Moved by Ahrens, seconded by King, to approve the September 11, 2013 meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

- E-mail from the Town of Rutland Board Chair expressing support for WisDOT’s USH 51/Roby Road intersection project in the TIP (in packet).
- E-mail from Joan Peterson, Strand Associates, providing an update on the USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) EIS Study (handed out). Design updates include the addition of pavement replacement and addition of auxiliary lanes on USH 51 in McFarland for both alternatives and a traffic signal at Roby Road, the project just mentioned. The draft EIS will be available sometime in December or January.

4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)

Royce Williams, Madison, commented on recent information related to the inter-city bus terminal. He said UW-Madison has recently expressed interest in moving the inter-city buses off Langdon Street. That would provide an incentive for the bus companies to agree to lease space in a new terminal. The pick up/drop up location used on University Avenue lacks a facility and interferes with Metro buses. He said other Midwest university towns all had terminals. He said it too bad that the City of Madison and WisDOT couldn’t agree on putting gates up at the long-term parking lot at Dutch Mill to require payment for use of that lot. Van Galder pays an annual maintenance fee for use of the lot. Gust said WisDOT offered to put the facilities in, but the city didn’t want to maintain the facilities. Williams said it should be looked at again as part of the current PNR lot study. An issue for the potential new terminal is how it is going to be funded, including the operating costs. He requested the issue be put on the MPO’s list of future work items even though the City of Madison is taking a lead role.

Opitz asked if Dutch Mill was the only free parking on Van Galder’s route between Madison and Chicago. Williams said he thought so. Opitz noted the parking at the lot is often full. He wondered if the time limits were being enforced and supported putting the item on a future agenda because the parking wasn’t being managed well. Kamp said the short-term parking is enforced. Kamp reported that Badger Bus had pulled out of Dutch Mill. Greyhound is interested in using the lot.

5. Resolution TPB No. 78 Adopting the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County

Schaefer pointed out the addition/correction sheet included in the packet. He reviewed the changes to the STP Urban project listings, all related to the 2018 projects. The cost estimate for the CTH PD project west of CTH M was increased, the Buckeye Road/CTH AB project was added as a programmed project, and CTH PD/McKee Road in the City of Fitchburg was dropped from the list. That project will be done with local TIF funding. In response to a question by Ahrens regarding programmed projects, Schaefer said that meant
available funding was committed for the project. In the past, with an annual application cycle the MPO commitment of STP Urban funding was less firm for outer year projects. A higher ranked project might be approved later pushing a project back in the schedule. However, that may change with the new way WisDOT would like to have the program administered as discussed at the last meeting. Schaefer said WisDOT and MPO staff are still working with WisDOT Central Office staff on questions and issues related to WisDOT’s new policy. He said the outer year projects should be considered preliminary. He also noted there was $300,000 that wasn’t programmed for a project at this time. In the past, the MPO preferred to maintain a balance of extra funding where possible to cover any increases in costs to high ranked projects as they move forward into final design and letting, especially with the MPO’s 50% cost share policy. There is a concern whether the MPO will have the ability to do that in the future.

Schaefer reviewed some of the more significant project changes and in particular the proposed new projects. Those included maintenance work on some Beltline bridges, a pavement replacement project on USH 18/151 in the Town of Springdale, and two new recently approved safety program projects for the USH 151/Broadway intersection in Sun Prairie and the STH 19/STH 113/CTH I intersection in the Town of Westport. Opitz asked if it would be a roundabout. Gust said it wasn’t decided, but a roundabout qualified for the most federal safety funding. Blau asked about advancing projects in the event funding becomes available. Schaefer said WisDOT does identify projects on an advanceable list. The MPO has not done that with STP Urban projects, but there may be an opportunity for that with the new way WisDOT is proposing to administer the program. Gust provided more information on how WisDOT handles that for state projects.

Clear asked about the potential use of STP Urban funding for the YWCA JobRide program that was discussed. Schaefer said he forgot to mention that, but Federal Transit Administration staff indicated STP Urban funding could not be used because it was an operating cost and the funds can only be used for capital projects. Schaefer said he did notice that some funding for the program was included in the City of Madison Executive operating budget. Kamp said was $120,000. Schaefer said he still wanted to follow up on the answer he got and would let the board know if anything changed.

Moved by King, seconded by Clear to adopt the 2014-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Madison Metropolitan Area & Dane County, as amended. Motion carried.

6. Resolution TPB No. 79 Adopting the 2013 Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County

Schaefer noted that staff had provided a presentation and update on the plan at previous meetings. The coordination team approved the draft plan with some minor changes reflected in the addition/change sheet included in the meeting packet. Cechvala reviewed the significant changes proposed to the draft. This included some revisions to the Medicaid and MA waiver fare reimbursement items to make them more accurate. He mentioned that staff had prepared a list of comments and responses that would be included as an appendix to the final report.

Moved by Blau, seconded by R. Schmidt, to adopt the 2013 Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County with the changes to the draft in the change/correction sheet. Motion carried.


Schaefer noted that the draft report was in the packet. Action wasn’t scheduled until the next meeting. He said MPO staff met with FHWA and WisDOT staff on the work program earlier in the day. They provided some comments, which MPO staff will incorporate into the final report. The comments focused mainly on things to facilitate WisDOT review of reimbursement requests.

Schaefer reviewed the major planning activities listed in the summary. Under the general System-wide Planning category, these included data collection and analysis efforts related to the Congestion Management
Process and plan performance measures, work on the regional travel model and refinement of the growth forecasts, and assistance with the City of Madison’s Sustainable Transportation Master Plan. Schaefer said it is anticipated that the major elements of the city plan would be incorporated into the MPO’s regional plan. Under TSM, work would continue to implement the new Congestion Management Process. The other major item is to work with City of Madison Traffic Engineering on a consultant project to develop a regional ITS plan to supplement the state’s plan for the freeway system. Additional activities include assisting Metro as needed in implementing recommendations of the Transit Development Plan and follow-up activities from the bus size study. Under Specialized Transportation, the major item is working with Metro to finalize and implement the agreement to jointly share responsibilities for administering the new section 5310 program. A resolution to approve that arrangement will be on the agenda for the next meeting. Under Corridor and Area Studies, major activities include assistance with WisDOT’s corridor studies, follow up activities from the BRT study, and support for the City of Madison’s South Capitol TOD District planning study. One final major effort is preparation of the update of the regional bicycle transportation plan.

Schaefer reviewed the work program budget table on page 43, which lists the anticipated staff time for the different work elements and allocates that time according to funding source. It is simpler than in past years because with the increase in planning funds the MPO no longer needed to rely on STP Urban and Metro Section 5307 funds to support its program. The only exception was the STP Urban funding for the MPO’s Rideshare/TDM activities, which can’t be supported with the planning funds. He mentioned the consultant contracts for the ITS plan, modeling support, and Capital Area RPC population and employment forecasting services. Blau asked what would happen if the RPC were to be eliminated. Schaefer said MPO staff would need to complete the population and employment forecasting work. He said that wouldn’t be a major problem since MPO staff has assisted RPC staff with this in the past and the RPC forecasts for urban service areas are similar to the Wisconsin Department of Administration municipal forecasts. Schaefer said he didn’t see that happening, but with the reduced budget the RPC was not planning to undertake a comprehensive update to the regional land use plan. There had been discussions about an integrated land use and transportation planning effort with the MPO.

8. **Review and Recommendation of Draft 2014 MPO Budget**

Schaefer reviewed the budget, which reflects the large increase in planning funds for next year. A large chunk of the increase will be used for the ITS plan. Schaefer said he anticipated hiring an additional staff person in 2015. Much of the increase in staff costs is attributable to increased MPO funding support for other city planning staff that are doing regional transportation planning work, including work on the city’s transportation plan, the South Capitol TOD District study, and other corridor/area planning work. The City of Madison is planning to hire an additional transportation planner that would be funded by the MPO, city, and Madison-Dane County Health Department. The budget for supplies and equipment went down due to reduced printing and postage costs with more electronic mailings and documents.

R. Schmidt asked to delay a vote on this until after discussion on the next item. The item was tabled by consensus and then taken up again after item 9.

Moved by Minihan, seconded by Clear to recommend approval of the 2014 MPO budget. Motion carried.

9. **Discussion and Possible Decision Item: MPO Role in Transit Planning and Development in the Context of Discussions by the Transit Subcommittee of the Dane County Public Works & Transportation Committee**

Matano introduced the item and said R. Schmidt had requested it. R. Schmidt said that even though she had been on the MPO Board and County Public Works Committee for a while she still didn’t have a sense of what the long-term vision for transit was beyond the existing Metro service area. She didn’t think there was a document that outlined the integrated transit vision with costs and priorities for improvements. She said she formed the Transit Subcommittee of the Dane County Public Works & Transportation Committee to discuss these issues in the absence of an RTA, but didn’t think much progress was being made. She said she wasn’t
clear about the role of the MPO in this effort. She said there were parts of it with the Transit Development Plan, BRT study, etc., but nothing integrated into one document. She mentioned she was involved with planning efforts for future development on the Alliant Energy Center site and was looking for a transit concept that connected the center to the UW campus, downtown, and other areas. She said she was planning one more meeting of the County Transit Subcommittee to discuss what the committee would like to see in terms of a comprehensive transit plan.

Mandli said the various MPO plans, including the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, have some of these elements, but no costs. Clear asked Schmidt it she was looking for a big picture strategic vision like the Transport 2020 map. Schmidt said that was part of it, but she was looking for a prioritized list of service improvements if an RTA was created. Matano said it might be worthwhile to reactivate the Transport 2020 committee. He said he had discussed some ideas with the County Executive’s staff about a potential role for the county in transit. He said he liked the idea of a map with all the proposals. Schaefer said he agreed there was no comprehensive, detailed long-range transit plan in one document, but that most of the pieces were there. He mentioned the map in the 2035 Plan that showed existing and future transit corridors, including BRT, rail, commuter express, and frequent local service. Between the BRT study and the TDP, there is quite a bit of detail in terms of service recommendations and costs that put the region in a good position to set priorities if an RTA were created. He said the BRT study showed potential extensions and felt that was a good vision for high capacity transit. Gust said that perhaps a summary could be prepared that referred to the other documents. Kamp said with Schaefer that we have most of what Schmidt is looking for, but understands the difficulty of those who aren’t involved in transit planning to visualize and understand the plan.

Discussion followed about setting up a meeting of a small group of persons to continue working on the issue and who should be represented. Kamp said the first thing should be to review what has already been done and see whether that meets the needs in terms of a vision or long-range plan. Schaefer said it was easier to produce a plan with priorities and timelines when there is a dedicated funding source. King agreed, saying Portland and Minneapolis were successful because they had coordinated funding. Blau commented that public transit was not a priority for suburban communities like DeForest. Kamp responded that transit includes shared ride taxis and human service transportation and not just buses. He said it was important for these communities to have transit connections to Madison as well. R. Schmidt said there was an educational component to the issue as well. Opitz commented that he thought there were people in DeForest and other communities that would use transit if it was available. Matano agreed on the importance of a marketing document on BRT and transit in general.

10. Report on Update of Roadway Functional Classification Map

Schaefer said FHWA asks state DOTs to work with MPOs to update the functional classification of roadways after each Census and change to the urbanized area boundaries. This was done last time in 2004. The functional classification of a roadway has funding and planning and design implications. WisDOT has adopted criteria for this consistent with FHWA criteria that include traffic volumes, land uses served, and spacing of the classified roadways. Schaefer said WisDOT and MPO staff had created a draft map with input from local planning/engineering staff that was reviewed with the MPO’s technical committee at their last meeting. It incorporates comments received to date. MPO staff has asked for any further comments to be provided in the next few weeks so a final draft map could be agreed upon at the committee’s November meeting. The map won’t be able to be officially adopted until next spring after traffic counts have been taken on newly designated collector streets for which they aren’t available. However, the new roadway functional classification system will require some minor changes to be made to the urbanized area boundary and the MPO will need to approve those changes by early next year.

Opitz said he had some concerns about some collector streets that were proposed in Middleton. He said he didn’t realize that traffic counts would be required, but thought they wouldn’t end up meeting the criteria. He also asked why CTH K in the Town of Springfield was only classified as a collector and not an arterial.
Schaefer said that was brought up previously. It is located in the rural area where different criteria apply. A rural roadway can’t be classified as an arterial based on traffic volumes alone, but must connect population centers over a certain size. In this case, there was already a more direct route, CTH M, connecting those centers so CTH K didn’t meet that criterion. Opitz asked if they still distinguished between major and minor collectors in rural areas, and Schaefer said no. Schaefer told board members to feel free to contact him with any comments on the map.

11. Status Report by Madison Area TPB Members on Other Projects Involving the TPB

Schaefer mentioned a special meeting had been set up for December 9 for all City of Madison transportation committees to review and discussion the recommendations from the Stoughton Road study. The draft EIS is expected to be available sometime in December or perhaps January. Matano mentioned the recent public meetings on the Beltline study. He also mentioned the City of Madison’s University Avenue study, which is focused on intersection improvements to facilitate traffic flow and pedestrian and bicycle crossing issues.

12. Discussion of Future Work Items

Schaefer that related to the consideration of revision to the structure of MPO Board, the federal guidance on transit provider representation on MPOs was just released. He said he would have the item on the next meeting agenda. He said the MPO redesignation agreement will need to be amended to reflect the change made to the board to formally designate a transit representative.

13. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, November 13, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. at the City-County Building, 210 MLK Jr. Blvd., Room 354.

14. Adjournment

Moved by Mandli, seconded by Gust, to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:57 PM.
**Re:** Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 80 Approving the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program and 2014-2016 Overall Program Design Report

**Staff Comments on Item:** A notice and summary of the draft 2014 Unified Planning Work Program was distributed to all local units of government within the MPO planning area and appropriate agencies, committees, and commissions for review and comment. MPO staff met with FHWA and WisDOT staff to review the draft Work Program. A correction sheet, dated November 2013, has been prepared incorporating comments received on the draft document.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. Change/Correction Sheet dated November 2013
2. Resolution TPB No. 80

[Note: The Draft 2014 Unified Planning Work Program and 2014-2016 Overall Program Design Report was distributed in the October meeting packet.]

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:** Staff recommends approval of Resolution TPB No. 80 and incorporating the changes identified in the correction sheet, dated November 2013. The 2014 Unified Planning Work Program is the basis for MPO contracts with local units of government and with local, state, and federal agencies for 2014 planning activities and funding.

*You may want to bring your draft copy of the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program dated September 2013 to the meeting for reference*
1. Page 1: Change Systemwide Transportation Planning person-months from 31.5 to 32.0.

2. Page 2: Edit first bullet under TSM Work Program category as follows:
   Adopt and implement the MPO’s updated Public Participation Plan, including methods to engage the environmental justice population groups.

3. Page 5: Add the following text before the map of the MPO planning boundaries:
The 2014 UPWP is prepared with input from local municipalities, Metro Transit and other transit providers, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and the public through the MPO’s advisory committees, the policy board, and other means consistent with the MPO’s Public Participation Plan. The MPO’s current Public Participation Plan is available on the MPO’s website at http://www.madisonareampo.org/planning/documents/MPOPublicParticPlan_Sept21_2007.pdf. The MPO is in the process of evaluating and making changes to the plan.

MPOs are required to certify that the metropolitan transportation planning process is being carried out in accordance with all applicable federal requirements. This self-certification is included in the adopting resolution for the UPWP. Among the federal requirements is compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The City of Madison is the administrative agent for the MPO. The MPO utilizes the Title VI & Civil Rights Compliance Plan and non-discrimination assurances of the city and the city’s Planning Division, which houses the MPO staff. The city’s Title VI plan, including its non-discrimination policy statement, assurances, and discrimination complaint process is available on the city’s website at http://www.cityofmadison.com/dcr/civilRights.cfm. The MPO has its own Limited English Proficiency Plan to ensure equal opportunities in its planning activities to persons with limited English proficiency.

4. Page 5: Edit legend of map of planning boundaries to indicate dates the urban area boundary was approved by U.S. DOT (6/11/13) and planning area boundary was approved by WisDOT (not yet approved).

5. Page 16: Add the following note under Subcategory 2100: Multimodal, System-Wide Transportation Planning:
A work plan schedule has been developed for the next major update to the Regional Transportation Plan, which will extend the plan horizon year to 2050 and be completed in late 2016. See page 18.
6. Page 17: Add the following sentence at the bottom of the page:
Staff person months includes 0.6 of non-MPO City of Madison planning staff time to assist with land use and socio-economic data collection and the planned land use geodatabase for City of Madison.


8. Page 20 – WE 2120 Plan Reappraisal: Edit last sentence of section on Previous Work to indicate the Public Participation Plan is expected to be completed in 2013 with adoption in early 2014.

9. Page 21: Add the following sentence just before WE 2120:
Staff person months includes 0.6 of non-MPO City of Madison planning staff time to assist with preparation of refinements to the Year 2050 TAZ level socio-economic data forecasts.

10. Page 23: Edit 4th bullet under WE 2210 TSM Planning as follows:
Adopt and implement the MPO’s updated Public Participation Plan, including methods to engage the environmental justice population groups.

11. Page 24: Delete the third bullet under WE 2220 Short-Range Transit Planning, which is already listed under WE 2520 Corridor – Major Studies.

12. Page 30: Delete the third to last bullet under WE 2510 Corridor and Area Studies – General, which is already listed under WE 2520 Corridor – Major Studies.

13. Page 30: Add the following sentence at the bottom of the page under WE 2510 Corridor and Area Studies - General:
Staff person months includes 7.05 of non-MPO City of Madison planning staff time to support preparation of the Sustainable Madison Transportation Plan and completion of work on the City of Madison’s South Capitol TOD District Planning Study and for other corridor and small area planning work.

14. Page 31: Add the following sentence after Estimated person-months under WE 2520 Corridor – Major Studies “Alternatives Analysis”:
Staff person months includes 0.45 of non-MPO City of Madison planning staff time to work with Metro and MPO staff on follow up activities form the BRT Study.

15. Page 37: Correct typo in last sentence under Rail Corridor Studies. Should refer to 2014 activities.

16. Page 43 – Budget and Work Program Elements Table: Add columns to the table showing MPO, non-MPO staff and total staff work hours by work element. See attached revised table.
17. Pages 1-1 to 1-3 – Provisional 2014 Cost Allocation Plan: Correct the cost per person month mentioned on page 1-1. It should be $10,250. Provide the correct, updated leave additive rate information on page 1-3.
## PROPOSED 2014 MADISON AREA TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>WDOT Work Element Person Percent (6)</th>
<th>MPO PERSON MONTHS</th>
<th>MPO STAFF HOURS</th>
<th>Non-MPO STAFF HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL STAFF HOURS</th>
<th>FHWA/FTA PL FUNDS 80.0%</th>
<th>WDOT Work STAFF PL FUNDS 80.0%</th>
<th>MPO/ URBAN 80.0% MPO/ STAFF PL FUNDS 80.0%</th>
<th>OTHER PROGRAMS (See key)</th>
<th>TOTAL MPO/ NON-LOCAL</th>
<th>Total MPO/ Local</th>
<th>MPO PROGRAM TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 MULTI-MODAL SYSTEM WIDE PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2110 Surveillance activities</td>
<td>50% LR</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>86,100</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>15,868</td>
<td>91,757</td>
<td>15,868</td>
<td>107,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120 Plan Reappraisal activities</td>
<td>100% LR</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>65,600</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>69,910</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130 Transportation Admin/Service</td>
<td>100% AD</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>73,800</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>13,601</td>
<td>78,649</td>
<td>13,601</td>
<td>92,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 TRANSP. SYST. MNGMT. ELEM. (TSM)</td>
<td>100% SR</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>61,500</td>
<td>4,041</td>
<td>11,334</td>
<td>65,541</td>
<td>11,334</td>
<td>76,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)</td>
<td>100% TIP</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>36,859</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>39,281</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>46,074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 CORRIDOR &amp; AREA STUDIES</td>
<td>50% LR</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>98,400</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>18,135</td>
<td>104,865</td>
<td>18,135</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2520 Corridor Major Alternatives Analysis-Staff</td>
<td>100% SR</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>32,800</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>34,955</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700 AIR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>100% SR</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800 OTHER TRANSPORTATION SPECIAL STUDIES</td>
<td>75% SR</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>45,100</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>48,063</td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>56,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2802 Other transportation-specific studies</td>
<td>25% SR</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2810 Ridesharing- STP Urban MPO staff</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>95,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2810 Ridesharing- STP Urban materials/adv.</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9,701</td>
<td>9,701</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2812 Capital Area RPC - MPO Planning Services</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>12,208</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>12,208</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>15,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2815 Capital Region Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>5,888</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER DIRECT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Modeling Support Services (WEs 2120, 2510)</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Transp. Systems (ITS) Plan (WE 2210)</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>10,512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF TOTAL COSTS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>177,021</td>
<td>10,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing &amp; Materials, ETC.</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>550,884</td>
<td>36,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2014 Cost</td>
<td>727,905</td>
<td>47,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) FHWA/FTA PL (80%), WisDOT (53.4%), MPO (14.66%)
(2) STP Urban Rideshare (80%) MPO (20%)
(3) Dane County
(4) Rideshare Advertising: WisDOA, UW, DANE COUNTY, MPO
(5) Capital Area Regional Planning Commission
(6) LR = Long Range; SR = Short Range, AD = Administration; TIP = TIP
Resolution TPB No. 80
Approving the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program
and 2014-2016 Overall Program Design Report

WHEREAS a Unified Planning Work Program is a requirement for receiving various Federal and state planning financial assistance; and

WHEREAS the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is annually updated, and is the first year of the 2014-2016 Overall Program Design Report; and

WHEREAS separate grant applications will be required to apply for the 2014 programmed planning grant funds, including applications to the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Dane County, and various local governmental units; and

WHEREAS the City of Madison is the administrative and fiscal agent for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board and is a legally constituted entity under the laws of the State of Wisconsin and able to receive these funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board approves the 2014 Unified Planning Work Program and the 2014-2016 Overall Program Design Report dated November 2013, which incorporates the changes reflected in the change/correction sheet dated November 2013 into the draft 2014 Unified Planning Work Program dated September 2013; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Transportation Planning Manager of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is authorized and directed to submit necessary applications to appropriate state, local, and federal departments for planning activities indicated for 2014 and to execute appropriate agreements and contracts with said agencies on behalf of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Transportation Planning Manager of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is authorized to file appropriate supporting documents and requisitions and to perform other duties and acts, which may be required as part of these planning grant contracts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the planning agency agrees to abide by all the provisions, terms, and conditions of said contracts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.334(a) the Madison Area Transportation Board hereby certifies that the metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

1. 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303, and this subpart;
2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 USC 2000d-1) and 49 CFR part 21;
3. 49 USC 5532, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, ex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Sections 1101(b) of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) (Pub. L. 112-141) and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the US DOT funded projects;
5. 23 CFR part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. Section 324 of title 23, U.S.C regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and

Date Adopted ____________________  Al Matano, Chair
Re:
Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 81 Regarding Agreement for Specialized Transportation Coordination Services with Dane County in 2014

Staff Comments on Item:
It is proposed that the Madison Area TPB continue to provide staff assistance to Dane County for specialized transit planning and coordination services as provided in previous years.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 81
2. Description of scope of work for proposed County funding of coordination services and Metro Transit’s promotion and transit information services.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 81
Regarding Agreement for
Specialized Transportation Coordination Services
with Dane County in 2014

WHEREAS, the staff of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – An MPO has historically provided assistance to Dane County for specialized transportation planning and coordination services; and

WHEREAS, the County is requesting that the Madison Area TPB continue this assistance of coordination services; and

WHEREAS, the County has budgeted $5,000 for this service for the year 2014; and

WHEREAS, this service is included in the MPO’s adopted 2014 Unified Planning Work Program; and

WHEREAS, the County requests that this agreement be part of Metro Transit’s service agreement and contract for transit information, promotion efforts, and operations, since the contracting agent for both Metro Transit and the Madison Area TPB is the City of Madison;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board agrees to have the TPB staff provide this service to Dane County in 2014 and authorizes the City of Madison on behalf of the Madison Area TPB to execute the agreement and contract to provide this service.

Date Adopted          Al Matano, Chair
Schedule A: Scope

Public Transit Services. Dane County will fund the following public transit services of the City of Madison to be provided by Metro Transit.

1. Assistance to Customer Service Center (CSC)

   The major area-wide information point for transit has been Metro’s Customer Service Center, which provides information on routes, schedules, etc., for those who telephone and responds to E-mail questions regarding routes and schedules. CSC representatives also provide paratransit ride scheduling, transportation referrals, and ridesharing (266-RIDE) referrals for vanpool and carpool services. Representatives utilize Teleinterpreters for interpretation services when callers who speak only foreign languages contact the CSC.

2. Transit Information/Promotion Assistance

   Provide assistance to Metro Transit for transit information and promotion costs including:
   - Creating “How to Ride” demonstration videos for distribution online and DVD.
   - Creating alternate language formats including Spanish and Hmong of video and print materials.
   - Printing Ride Guides, System Maps and schedules.
   - Promoting new Commute Card pass and existing prepaid fares such as 31-Day, 31-Day Senior/Disabled, and 2-4-6 Weekend & Holiday Passes.
   - Promoting Park & Ride lots, commuter routes and routes to outlying parts of the Madison urban area (such as Fitchburg routes 44, 48 & 52; Middleton routes 70, 71, 72, 73 & 74, etc.).
   - Creating other promotional materials including public information to increase awareness of Metro.

   Overall transit information/promotion program is to be approved by County Transportation Committee prior to release of funds.

3. Contribution Toward Operating Costs of Metro Transit

   During 2014 Metro Transit plans to continue to focus on employee pass programs (such as the UW and St. Mary’s employee passes) and the Commuter Choice Benefit program to attract more county and regional use. Additional plans, in 2014, include continuing bus stop sign replacement program and installing maps and schedule information in Metro shelters to make riding Metro easier. This funding will assist Metro with some local share costs of this effort.
Specialized Transportation. Dane County will fund the following specialized transportation planning and coordination services of the City of Madison to be provided by the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board.

1) Providing technical assistance to the Dane County Specialized Transportation Commission and Dane County Transit Subcommittee, as needed.

2) Providing technical assistance to the Adult Community Services Division of the Department of Human Services in planning, coordinating and evaluating their specialized transportation services.

3) Assisting in monitoring of and collecting data on the operations of specialized transportation providers, and collecting and analyzing data on the location of elderly and persons with disabilities from the American Community Survey and other sources.

4) Assisting with implementation of the 2013 Dane County Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan recommendations.

5) Working with Dane County and Metro Transit to prioritize projects for Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for E/D Persons Program and assisting Metro in administering the program.

6) Coordinating various projects with county agencies and service providers, both public and private, to make Dane County's specialized transportation services more cost-effective.

Schedule B: Payments

a. Upon receipt of invoice from the City of Madison, payment will be rendered as follows:

Payment in full for Mass Transit Services ($19,300 to Metro Transit)

1. Assistance for Customer Service Center
2. Transit Info/Promotion Assistance (following committee approval)

b. Upon receipt of invoices from the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, payment will be rendered as follows:

Payment for Specialized Transit Coordination ($5,000 to Madison Area Transportation Planning Board)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule C: Reports

Progress reports will be provided County staff quarterly.
Re:
Consideration of Resolution No. 82 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter Into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) to Provide Transportation Planning Work Activities to CARPC in 2014

Staff Comments on Item:
CARPC is requesting $15,000 from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for transportation planning activities for areas in Dane County outside of the Madison Metropolitan Area. About $9,700 of the $15,000 will be set aside for MPO planning services.

CARPC is requesting that the Madison Area TPB, as the MPO for the region, provide these services in a similar manner as in 2013.

These services are to consist of conducting an analysis of the impact of Urban Service Area amendments on the overall transportation system, particularly the impact on rural transportation systems, including general transportation considerations, and preparing the transportation section of CARPC’s Annual Trends Report. MPO staff may also be asked to analyze the traffic and other transportation impacts of the recommended land use scenarios as part of Future Urban Development Analyses being conducted for different areas in the county.

This activity is included in the adopted 2014 Unified Planning Work Program of the MPO

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 82
2. Draft agreement between City of Madison and CARPC for MPO to provide planning services

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 82

Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) to Provide Transportation Planning Work Activities to the CARPC in 2014

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison Metropolitan Area with responsibilities to perform metropolitan transportation planning and programming activities; and

WHEREAS, the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) is in need of services to conduct transportation planning for areas in Dane County, particularly outside of the Madison Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, CARPC is requesting $9,700 from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for transportation planning activities for areas in Dane County outside of the Madison Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, CARPC is also requesting that the Madison Area TPB, as the MPO for the region, provide these services in a similar manner as in 2013; and

WHEREAS, these services are to consist of (1) conducting an analysis of the impact of Urban Service Area amendments on the overall transportation system, particularly the impact on rural transportation systems, including general transportation considerations; (2) preparing the transportation section of CARPC’s Annual Trends Report; and (3) conducting an analysis of transportation issues associated with development of plans for sustainable growth consistent with CARPC’s Future Urban Development Area planning; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB will bill the CARPC on a quarterly basis for the cost of these services not to exceed $9,700 for calendar year 2014; and

WHEREAS, this work activity is included in the adopted 2014 Unified Planning Work Program of the Madison Area TPB;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) authorizes the City of Madison to enter into an agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for the Madison Area TPB to provide transportation planning work activities to the CARPC in calendar year 2014 and to provide for the reimbursement of staff services for an amount not to exceed $9,700.

Date Adopted       Al Matano, Chair
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY OF MADISON AND THE
CAPITAL AREA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SERVICES

Parties: This agreement is by and between the City of Madison, hereafter “City,” and Capital Area Regional Planning Commission, hereafter “CARPC.”

Term: The term of this agreement is January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.

Scope of Services: The City will provide transportation planning services to the CARPC. These services will be provided by City staff of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) – An MPO. These planning services will consist primarily of conducting analyses of the impact of Urban Service Area amendments on the overall transportation system, particularly the impact on rural transportation systems, including general considerations, and preparing the transportation section of CARPC’s Annual Trends Report. Services may also include analysis of transportation issues associated with development of plans for sustainable growth consistent with CARPC’s Future Urban Development Area planning.

Payment: The City of Madison will bill CARPC on a quarterly basis for the cost of providing the transportation planning services. A progress report on planning services provided will be submitted with the quarterly invoice. The total cost of these services is estimated not to exceed $9,700 for calendar year 2014.

Non-Discrimination: During the term of this agreement, the parties agree to abide by their respective policies of non-discrimination and affirmative action. Further, the parties agree that this agreement does not subject either party to the other’s jurisdiction for the determination of such matters.

Liability: CARPC shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. City shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. The obligations of the parties under this paragraph shall survive the expiration or termination of this agreement.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties have caused this agreement to be executed by individuals and officers duly authorized on the dates noted below.
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 83 Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter Into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for CARPC to Provide Population and Employment Forecasting Services

Staff Comments on Item:
To ensure consistency between regional land use and transportation planning, the MPO relies on CARPC for urban service area (USA) and rural area population forecasts that are used as a starting point for preparing the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level growth allocations that serve as a key input to the regional travel model. CARPC uses the population forecasts to estimate future land demand for its sewer service area planning and approval process. In 2013 CARPC began updating its methodology for preparing its USA and rural population forecasts using the Wisconsin Department of Administration’s (WisDOA) county population forecasts. Updated WisDOA population forecasts are expected to be made available before the end of the year. CARPC also began developing a methodology for preparing county and USA level employment forecasts. A labor supply forecast is being developed to aid in preparing the county employment forecast. CARPC will be completing this work in 2014.

Because the USA level population and employment forecasts prepared by CARPC are used by the MPO for preparing TAZ level growth allocations as part of the regional traffic forecasting process, it is proposed that the MPO utilize some of its increased federal planning funds to continue to support CARPC’s work. The funding, which will be the same amount passed through in 2013 ($12,208 with CARPC covering the $3,052 local share), will also be used for CARPC to work with the MPO in preparing an alternative growth scenario for the next regional transportation plan. The forecasts will also be used by WisDOT for its major corridor studies, including the Beltline study. The alternative growth scenario will assume more infill/redevelopment, accounting for demographic trends and other factors affecting the demand for walkable, transit-supportive development. It will utilize the work done as part of the TOD market study. An agreement has been prepared for the MPO to contract with CARPC for this work.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 83
2. Draft Agreement with CARPC for CARPC’s forecasting services

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends approval.
Resolution TPB No. 83

Authorizing the City of Madison to Enter into an Agreement with the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) for CARPC to Provide Population and Employment Forecasting Services to the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Madison Metropolitan Area with responsibilities to perform metropolitan transportation planning and programming activities; and

WHEREAS, in order to ensure coordination of regional land use and transportation planning the Madison Area TPB relies on the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) to provide population and employment projections for urban service areas in order to allocate future growth to smaller areas for regional travel forecasting as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area TPB has agreed to use $12,208 of its Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Planning grant funds to cover the cost of these population and employment forecasting services by CARPC with CARPC agreeing to cover the $3,052 in local match funding required; and

WHEREAS, CARPC’s services are to consist of (1) completing work to develop and apply methodologies for allocating county-wide Year 2040 population projections (provided by the Wisconsin Department of Administration) to the urban service areas and rural area of the county and for preparing county-wide Year 2040 employment projections and allocating the employment to the urban service areas; and (2) working with Madison Area TPB staff on a methodology for developing an alternative future growth scenario taking into account demographic changes and other factors affecting the demand for housing and employment in walkable, transit-supportive, mixed-use areas; and

WHEREAS, CARPC will invoice the City of Madison on a quarterly basis for the total cost of these services not to exceed $15,260, but will only charge the City for 80% of the cost in order to cover the required local match to the FHWA planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the work by CARPC is included in the Madison Area TPB’s adopted 2014 Unified Planning Work Program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area TPB authorizes the City of Madison to enter into an agreement with CARPC for CARPC to provide these population and employment forecasting services utilizing FHWA Planning grant funding of $12,208 on the condition that CARPC cover the $3,052 required local match for the grant.

________________________________________  _________________________________
Date Adopted                              Al Matano, Chair

Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY OF MADISON AND THE
CAPITAL AREA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTING SERVICES

Parties: This agreement is by and between the City of Madison, hereafter “City,” and Capital Area Regional Planning Commission, hereafter “CARPC.”

Term: The term of this agreement is January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.

Scope of Services: CARPC will provide population and employment forecasting services to the City staff for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB). Specifically, these services are to consist of (1) completing work to develop and apply methodologies for allocating county-wide Year 2040 population projections (provided by the Wisconsin Department of Administration) to the urban service areas and rural area of the county and for preparing county-wide Year 2040 employment projections and allocating the employment to the urban service areas; and (2) working with Madison Area TPB staff on a methodology for developing an alternative future growth scenario taking into account demographic changes and other factors affecting the demand for housing and commercial development in walkable, transit-supportive, mixed-use areas.

Payment: CARPC will invoice the City of Madison on a quarterly basis for the cost of providing the population and employment forecasting services, but will only charge the City for 80% of the cost. The remaining 20% of the cost—which constitutes the local match to the Federal Planning funds that the City will be receive from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation for the services—will be covered by CARPC. The total cost of these services will not exceed $15,260 (and the 80% billed to the City will not exceed $12,208) for calendar year 2014.

Non-Discrimination: During the term of this agreement, the parties agree to abide by their respective policies of non-discrimination and affirmative action. Further, the parties agree that this agreement does not subject either party to the other’s jurisdiction for the determination of such matters.

Liability: CARPC shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. City shall be responsible for injuries, claims and losses arising from or caused by the acts or omissions of its officers, employees, agencies, boards, commissions and representatives. The obligations of the parties under this paragraph shall survive the expiration or termination of this agreement.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties have caused this agreement to be executed by individuals and officers duly authorized on the dates noted below.
CAPITAL AREA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

By: ________________________________  By: ________________________________
    Kamran Mesbah                              Paul Soglin
    Deputy Director                            Mayor

Date: ________________________________  Date: ________________________________

By: ________________________________
    Maribeth Witzel-Behl
    City Clerk

Date: ________________________________

Countersigned:

By: ________________________________
    David Schmiedicke
    City Finance Director

Date: ________________________________

Approved as to Form:

By: ________________________________
    Michael May
    City Attorney

Date: ________________________________
Re:
Resolution TPB No. 84 Supporting Metro Transit as the Designated Recipient of Funding for the Federal Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program for the Madison Urbanized Area

Staff Comments on Item:
The current federal transportation authorization bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), combined two previous Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs to create the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310). The Section 5310 funds are apportioned to rural, small urban, and large urban areas. In large urban areas over 200,000 population such as Madison (called Transportation Management Areas or TMAs), a designated recipient of the Section 5310 funds must be designated by the state and local officials. In discussions between MPO and Metro Transit and other City of Madison staff, it was agreed that it made the most sense for Metro Transit to be the designated recipient (DR) of funds. Metro Transit is the DR for other FTA funds and has the requisite staff capabilities to receive and administer the funds under this program. The DR is responsible for applying to FTA for the program grants on behalf of itself and/or other grant sub-recipients. The DR is also responsible for all aspects of grant administration, including reporting to the FTA. Metro will be able to use up to 10% of the grant funds for program administration costs.

While Metro will be the DR, the MPO will assist Metro by preparing the required Program Management and Recipient Coordination Plan and will also prioritize and select the projects for funding. As the regional transportation planning agency, it makes sense for the MPO to select the projects. Also, Metro will be competing with other agencies for the funding. The division of responsibilities between Metro and the MPO will be spelled out in the Program Management Plan. That will be on the MPO’s December meeting agenda for approval. The City of Madison will also need to adopt a resolution approving this arrangement and the application to FTA for funds in 2014.

Following action on the MPO resolution supporting Metro as the DR, it is expected that the Governor will officially designate Metro along with the other DRs in other TMAs in the state.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Resolution TPB No. 84.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends adoption of Resolution TPB No. 84.
Resolution TPB No. 84

Supporting Designation of the City of Madison – Metro Transit as the Designated Recipient for the Madison Urbanized Area’s Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program Funds

WHEREAS, the federal transportation bill Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) combined the former Section 5317 New Freedom Program and Section 5310 Transportation for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities program into a revised Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program; and

WHEREAS, the Section 5310 program funds in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs), urbanized areas with a population over 200,000, are apportioned to a recipient designated by the state; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Urbanized Area (UZA) is a designated TMA with a population exceeding 200,000; and

WHEREAS, the most appropriate entity to administer Section 5310 program grants in the Madison Urbanized Area is the City of Madison – Metro Transit, which currently administers similar federal and state grants; and

WHEREAS, up to 10 percent of the Madison Urbanized Area’s total fiscal year apportionment may be used to fund program administration costs, including administration, planning and technical assistance at up to 100% federal share for projects funded in the Section 5310 program; and

WHEREAS, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – an MPO is the most appropriate entity to prioritize and select projects for funding because it is the policy body responsible for cooperative, comprehensive regional transportation planning and decision making for the Madison Metropolitan Planning Area, including the preparation of the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan for Dane County and the Transit Development Plan for the Madison Urban Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - an MPO supports the designation of the City of Madison – Metro Transit as the recipient for Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – an MPO will be responsible for preparing a Program Management Plan (PMP) in coordination with Metro Transit, prioritizing and selecting projects for Section 5310 program funding, and preparing the Program of Projects (POP) for the funds as part of the Transportation Improvement Program development process.

Date Adopted: ____________________________
Al Matano, Chair,
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
Re:

Continued Discussion and Possible Decision Item: Recommendation Regarding Potential Revision to MPO Board Structure and Membership Due to Expanded Metropolitan Planning Area

Staff Comments on Item:

The MPO Board adopted a new expanded metropolitan planning area at its April meeting. It is expected that WisDOT will approve the new planning area boundary soon. The MPO Board is required to consider possible changes in the representation on the board in light of the new expanded planning area. A change is not required to be made because of the new planning area. However, a change in the board structure is necessary anyway to meet the new requirement under MAP-21 that large MPOs include a representative from the major transit operator. While Metro Transit is currently represented on the board due to the appointment of Metro General Manager Chuck Kamp by the City of Madison Mayor, the MPO agreement does not require the Mayor to appoint a Metro Transit representative.

Proposed federal guidance on the issue of transit agency representation on MPOs was released on September 30. The guidance says the transit representative should be an elected official or direct representative employed by the agency such as the general manager. The MPO may be restructured to meet the transit representation requirement without going through a redesignation process. However, the agreement designating the Madison Area TPB requires that the same process be used, except agreement of the Governor. That is, the MPO must first adopt the change and then local units of government representing 75% of the population in the MPO planning area must adopt resolutions supporting or ratifying the change. The MPO has until October 2014 to make the changes to the MPO Board structure.

Staff prepared some different scenarios for possible restructuring of the board to stimulate discussion. The board had an initial discussion on the scenarios at its September meeting, but decided to wait until the federal guidance was released before taking any further action. Most of those that commented at the September meeting seemed to support Scenario 2, but all of the scenarios developed have been provided again for discussion purposes.

Materials Presented on Item:

1. Proposed federal guidance on MAP-21 requirement of public transportation provider representation in large MPOs.
2. Document outlining different alternative scenarios for MPO Board appointments and representation percentages.
3. Document outlining different options for groupings of municipalities if a change is made from at large representatives for the non-Madison cities and villages.
4. Memo from Matano regarding composition of the MPO Board distributed at the September meeting.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:

For discussion and a possible recommendation at this time. Staff recommends that the board make a recommendation and then send a communication to local officials inviting comment on that and any other alternative scenarios the board wishes to provide. The Dane County Cities& Villages Association and Towns Association can be used to facilitate input from local officials on the issue.
rate of crash involvement than the general population. The diabetes rule provides that “A person is physically qualified to drive a commercial motor vehicle if that person has no established medical history or clinical diagnosis of diabetes mellitus currently requiring insulin for control” (49 CFR 391.41(b)(3)).

FMCSA established its diabetes exemption program, based on the Agency’s July 2000 study entitled “A Report to Congress on the Feasibility of a Program to Qualify Individuals with Insulin-Treated Diabetes Mellitus to Operate in Interstate Commerce as Directed by the Transportation Act for the 21st Century.” The report concluded that a safe and practicable protocol to allow some drivers with ITDM to operate CMVs is feasible. The September 3, 2003 (68 FR 52441), Federal Register notice in conjunction with the November 8, 2005 (70 FR 67777), Federal Register notice provides the current protocol for allowing such drivers to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

These 16 applicants have had ITDM over a range of 1 to 28 years. These applicants report no severe hypoglycemic reactions resulting in loss of consciousness or seizure, requiring the assistance of another person, or resulting in impaired cognitive function that occurred without warning symptoms, in the past 12 months and no recurrent (2 or more) severe hypoglycemic episodes in the past 5 years. In each case, an endocrinologist verified that the driver has demonstrated a willingness to properly monitor and manage his/her diabetes mellitus, received education related to diabetes management, and is on a stable insulin regimen. These drivers report no other disqualifying conditions, including diabetes-related complications. Each meets the vision requirement at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10).

The qualifications and medical condition of each applicant were stated and discussed in detail in the June 26, 2013, Federal Register notice and they will not be repeated in this notice.

Discussion of Comments

FMCSA received two comments in this proceeding. The comments are considered and discussed below.

Laurie Susan Palmer expressed concern regarding the new A1C testing regulations.

John D. Heffington requested information regarding the new A1C testing regulations.

Basis for Exemption Determination

Under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA may grant an exemption from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) if the exemption is likely to achieve an equivalent or greater level of safety than would be achieved without the exemption. The exemption allows the applicants to operate CMVs in interstate commerce.

To evaluate the effect of these exemptions on safety, FMCSA considered medical reports about the applicants’ ITDM and vision, and reviewed the treating endocrinologists’ medical opinion related to the ability of the driver to safely operate a CMV while using insulin.

Consequently, FMCSA finds that in each case exempting these applicants from the diabetes requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3) is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

Conditions and Requirements

The terms and conditions of the exemption will be provided to the applicants in the exemption document and they include the following: (1) That each individual submit a quarterly monitoring checklist completed by the treating endocrinologist as well as an annual checklist with a comprehensive medical evaluation; (2) that each individual reports within 2 business days of occurrence, all episodes of severe hypoglycemia, significant complications, or inability to manage diabetes; and, any involvement in an accident or any other adverse event in a CMV or personal vehicle, whether or not it is related to an episode of hypoglycemia; (3) that each individual provide a copy of the ophthalmologist’s or optometrist’s report to the medical examiner at the time of the annual medical examination; and (4) that each individual provide a copy of the annual medical certification to the employer for retention in the driver’s qualification file, or keep a copy in his/her driver’s qualification file if he/she is self-employed. The driver must also have a copy of the certification when driving, for presentation to a duly authorized Federal, State, or local enforcement official.

Conclusion

Based upon its evaluation of the 16 exemption applications, FMCSA exempts Tyler A. Benjam (AL), Larry K. Brindle (KS), James D. Damske (MA), Manuel M. Fabela, Jr. (CA), Ryan L. Gaffey (IL), Richard B. Harvey (CA), Donald F. Kurzejewski (PA), Joshua O. Lilly (VA), Steven C. Lundberg (IA), Frank D. Marcou, Jr. (VT), Roger D. Mott (IL), Bernard K. Nixon (FL), Thomas P. Olson (WI), Steven T. Vanderburg (NC), John P. Washington (NJ), and Christopher J. Wisner (MD) from the ITDM requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(3), subject to the conditions listed under “Conditions and Requirements” above.

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 each exemption will be valid for two years unless revoked earlier by FMCSA. The exemption will be revoked if the following occurs: (1) The person fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the exemption; (2) the exemption has resulted in a lower level of safety than was maintained before it was granted; or (3) continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315. If the exemption is still effective at the end of the 2-year period, the person may apply to FMCSA for a renewal under procedures in effect at that time.

Issued on: September 20, 2013.

Larry W. Minor,
Associate Administrator for Policy.
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Proposed Policy Guidance on Metropolitan Planning Organization Representation

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Proposed policy guidance; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FTA and FHWA are jointly issuing this proposed guidance on implementation of provisions of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21), Public Law 112–141, that require representation by providers of public transportation in each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) that serves a transportation management area (TMA) no later than October 1, 2014. The purpose of this guidance is to assist MPOs and providers of public transportation in complying with this new requirement.

DATES: Comments must be received by October 30, 2013. Any comments
received beyond this deadline will be considered to the extent practicable.

**ADDRESSES: Comments.** You may submit comments identified by the docket number (FTA–2013–0029) by any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** Go to [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) and follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- **DOT Electronic Docket:** Go to [dms.dot.gov](http://dms.dot.gov) and follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- **Docket Management Facility:** Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590.
- **Hand Delivery or Courier:** Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, Southeast, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.
- **Fax:** 202–493–2251.

**Instructions:** You must include the agency names (Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration) and docket number (FTA–2013–0029) for this notice at the beginning of your comments. You must submit two copies of your comments if you submit them by mail. If you wish to receive confirmation that FTA and FHWA received your comments, you must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard. Due to security procedures in effect since October 2001, mail received through the U.S. Postal Service may be subject to delays. Parties submitting comments may wish to consider using an express mail firm to ensure prompt filing of any submissions not filed electronically or by hand. All comments received will be posted, without change and including any personal information provided, to [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), where they will be available to Internet users. You may review DOT’s complete procedures and follow the instructions at [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).

- **Hand Delivery or Courier:** Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, Southeast, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.
- **Fax:** 202–493–2251.

**Instructions:** You must include the agency names (Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration) and docket number (FTA–2013–0029) for this notice at the beginning of your comments. You must submit two copies of your comments if you submit them by mail. If you wish to receive confirmation that FTA and FHWA received your comments, you must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard. Due to security procedures in effect since October 2001, mail received through the U.S. Postal Service may be subject to delays. Parties submitting comments may wish to consider using an express mail firm to ensure prompt filing of any submissions not filed electronically or by hand. All comments received will be posted, without change and including any personal information provided, to [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), where they will be available to Internet users. You may review DOT’s complete procedures and follow the instructions at [http://www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dwayne Weeks, FTA Office of Planning and Environment, telephone (202) 366–4033 or Dwayne.Weeks@dot.gov; or Harlan Miller, FHWA Office of Planning, telephone (202) 366–0847 or Harlan.Miller@dot.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Introduction**

The FTA and FHWA are jointly issuing this proposed policy guidance on the implementation of 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B), which require representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA. The FTA and FHWA anticipate issuing a joint notice of proposed rulemaking to amend 23 CFR part 450 to implement 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B) as amended by sections 1201 and 20005 of MAP–21. These United States Code sections now require representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA. A TMA is defined as an urbanized area with a population of over 200,000 individuals as determined by the 2010 census, or an urbanized area with a population of fewer than 200,000 individuals that is designated as a TMA by the request of the Governor and the MPO designated for the area. As of the date of this guidance, the 384 MPOs throughout the Nation, 184 MPOs serve an area designated as a TMA.

The FTA conducted an On-Line Dialogue on this requirement from March 5 through March 29, 2013. Through this forum, FTA received input from MPOs, local elected officials, transit agencies, and the general public, with over 3,000 visits to the Web site. Over 100 ideas were submitted from 340 registered users who also provided hundreds of comments and votes on these ideas. Participants discussed the complex nature of MPOs and the advantages of providing flexibility for MPOs and transit providers to decide locally how to include representation by providers of public transportation in the MPO.

To increase the accountability and transparency of the Federal-aid highway and Federal transit programs and to improve project decision-making through performance-based planning and programming, MAP–21 establishes a performance management framework. The MAP–21 requires FHWA to establish, through separate rulemakings, state of good repair and safety performance measures, and requires each provider of public transportation to establish performance targets in relation to these performance measures.

To ensure consistency, an MPO must coordinate to the maximum extent practicable with the State and providers of public transportation to establish performance targets for the metropolitan planning area that address these performance measures. An MPO must describe in its metropolitan transportation plans the performance measures and targets used to assess the performance of its transportation system. Statewide and metropolitan transportation improvement programs (STIPs and TIPs) must include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the program toward achieving the performance targets established in the statewide or metropolitan transportation plan, linking investment priorities and the highway and transit performance targets. These changes to the planning process will be addressed in FHWA and FTA’s anticipated joint rulemaking amending 23 CFR part 450.

As part of its performance management framework, MAP–21 assigns MPOs the new transit related responsibilities described above, i.e., to establish performance targets with respect to transit state of good repair and transit safety and to address these targets in their transportation plans and TIPs. Representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves a TMA will better enable the MPO to define performance targets and to develop plans and TIPs that support an intermodal transportation system for the metropolitan area. Including representation by providers of public transportation in each MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA is an essential element of MAP–21’s performance management framework and will support the successful implementation of a performance-based approach to transportation decisionmaking.

The FTA and FHWA seek comment on the following proposals in this guidance: the determination of specifically designated representatives, the eligibility of representatives of providers of public transportation to...
serve as specifically designated representatives, and the cooperative process to select a specifically designated representative in MPOs with multiple providers of public transportation. There is wide variation in transit agency representation among MPOs and in the governance structure of MPOs throughout the country. To accommodate the many existing models of transit agency representation on MPO boards, this proposed guidance proposes flexible approaches for MPOs and providers of public transportation to work together to meet this requirement.

II. Specifically Designated Representatives

MAP–21 requires that by October 1, 2014, MPOs that serve an area designated as a TMA must include local elected officials; officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area, including representation by providers of public transportation; and appropriate State officials. The requirement to include “representation by providers of public transportation” is a new requirement under MAP–21. The FHWA and FTA construe that the intent of this provision is that representatives of providers of public transportation, once designated, will have equal decision-making rights and authorities as other members listed in 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B) that are on the policy board of an MPO that serves a TMA. This expectation reflects the long-standing position of FHWA and FTA with respect to statutorily required MPO board members.

A public transportation representative on an MPO board is referred to herein as the “specifically designated representative.” A specifically designated representative should be an elected official or a direct representative employed by the agency being represented, such as a member of a public transportation provider’s board of directors, or a senior transit agency official like a chief executive officer or a general manager.

III. Providers of Public Transportation

This guidance proposes that only representation by providers of public transportation that operate in a TMA and are direct recipients of the Urbanized Area Formula Funding program will satisfy 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B).

IV. Process for the Selection of Specifically Designated Representatives

The FHWA and FTA’s Metropolitan Transportation Planning rule at 23 CFR 450.314 provides for metropolitan planning agreements in which MPOs, States, and providers of public transportation cooperatively determine their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. This guidance proposes that MPOs that serve an area designated as a TMA should cooperate with providers of public transportation and the State to amend their metropolitan planning agreements to include the cooperative process for selecting the specifically designated representative(s) for inclusion on the MPO board and for identifying the representative(s) role and responsibilities.

V. Role of the Specifically Designated Representative

To the extent that an MPO has bylaws, the MPO should, in consultation with transit providers in the TMA, develop bylaws that describe the establishment, roles, and responsibilities of the specifically designated representative. These bylaws should explain by which the specifically designated representative will identify transit-related issues for consideration by the full MPO policy board and verify that transit priorities are considered in planning products to be adopted by the MPO. In TMAs with multiple providers of public transportation, the bylaws also should outline how the specifically designated representative(s) will consider the needs of all eligible providers of public transportation and address issues that are relevant to the responsibilities of the MPO.

VI. Restructuring MPOs To Include Representation by Providers of Public Transportation

Title 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(5)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(5)(B) provide that an MPO may be restructured to meet MAP–21’s representation requirements without having to secure the agreement of the Governor and units of general purpose government as part of a redesignation.

There are multiple providers of public transportation within most TMAs. In large MPOs that include numerous municipal jurisdictions and multiple providers of public transportation, FTA and FHWA expect that it would not be practical to allocate separate representation to each provider of public transportation. Consequently, this guidance proposes that an MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA that has multiple providers of public transportation should cooperate with the eligible providers to determine how the MPO will include representation by providers of public transportation.

There are various approaches to meeting this requirement. For example, an MPO may allocate a single board position to eligible providers of public transportation collectively, providing that one specifically designated representative must be agreed upon through the cooperative process. The requirement for specifically designated representation might also be met by rotating the board position among eligible providers or by having all eligible providers with proportional representation. However, the representation is ultimately designated, the MPO should provide specifics of the designation in its bylaws, to the extent it has bylaws.

Apart from the requirement for specifically designated representation on the MPO’s board, an MPO also may allow for transit representation on policy or technical committees. Eligible providers of public transportation might also be met by having transit providers to take this opportunity to determine the most effective governance and institutional arrangements to best serve the interests of the metropolitan planning area.

Peter Rogoff,
FTA Administrator.
Vitor M. Mendez,
FHWA Administrator.
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8 While this guidance specifically addresses the new requirement for representation by providers of public transportation, all MPOs that serve a TMA must consist of local elected officials; officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area, including representation by providers of public transportation; and appropriate State officials. The requirement to include “representation by providers of public transportation” is a new requirement under MAP–21. The FHWA and FTA construe that the intent of this provision is that representatives of providers of public transportation, once designated, will have equal decision-making rights and authorities as other members listed in 23 U.S.C. 134(d)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(d)(2)(B) that are on the policy board of an MPO that serves a TMA. This expectation reflects the long-standing position of FHWA and FTA with respect to statutorily required MPO board members.

9 A direct recipient is defined as a public entity that is legally eligible under Federal transit law to apply for and receive grants directly from FTA.
11 Eligible transit agencies are those that are direct recipients of the Urbanized Area Formula Funding program, 49 U.S.C. 5307, and operate in a TMA.
12 Cooperation means that the parties involved in carrying out the transportation planning and programming processes work together to achieve a common goal or objective. 23 CFR 450.104.
### Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO
### Appointments & Representation Percentages

(For Discussion Purposes Only)

#### Scenario 1: Existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Exec</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>C. &amp; V.</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Cities &amp; Villages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scenario 2: Eliminate One City of Madison Appt., add Metro Transit Rep. (General Manager or possibly TPC Chair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Exec</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>C. &amp; V.</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Cities &amp; Villages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scenario 3: Add Additional Small Cities/Villages Appt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Exec</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>C. &amp; V.</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Cities &amp; Villages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scenario 4: Add Small Cities/Villages Appt. and add Metro Transit Rep. (General Manager or possibly TPC Chair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Exec</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>C. &amp; V.</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Cities &amp; Villages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scenario 5: Eliminate One County Executive Appt. and Add Small Cities/Villages Appt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Exec</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>C. &amp; V.</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Cities &amp; Villages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Madison Area Transportation Planning Board - An MPO
### Appointments & Representation Percentages

(For Discussion Purposes Only)

#### Scenario 1: Existing

- **County Executive**: 3
- **City of Madison**: 6
- **Sm. Cities & Villages**: 3
- **Towns**: 1
- **WisDOT**: 1

#### Scenario 2: Eliminate One City of Madison Appt., add Metro Transit Rep. (General Manager or possibly TPC Chair)

- **County Executive**: 3
- **City of Madison**: 5
- **Sm. Cities & Villages**: 3
- **Towns**: 1
- **Metro Transit**: 1
- **WisDOT**: 1

#### Scenario 3: Add Additional Small Cities/Villages Appt.

- **County Executive**: 3
- **City of Madison**: 6
- **Sm. Cities & Villages**: 4
- **Towns**: 1
- **WisDOT**: 1

#### Scenario 4: Add Small Cities/Villages Appt. and add Metro Transit Rep. (General Manager or possibly TPC Chair)

- **County Executive**: 3
- **City of Madison**: 6
- **Sm. Cities & Villages**: 4
- **Towns**: 1
- **Metro Transit**: 1
- **WisDOT**: 1

#### Scenario 5: Eliminate One County Executive Appt. and Add Small Cities/Villages Appt.

- **County Executive**: 2
- **City of Madison**: 6
- **Sm. Cities & Villages**: 4
- **Towns**: 1
- **WisDOT**: 1
### Scenario 6: Eliminate County Executive Appt., Add Small Cities/Villages Appt., and Add Metro Transit Rep. (General Manager or TPC Chair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Exec</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>C. &amp; V.</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>NEW 2010 Planning Area Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Cities &amp; Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Under Scenarios 1, 3 and 5, City of Madison Mayor might be required to appoint a representative for Metro Transit as one of his appointments depending upon pending FTA guidelines. That representative could probably be either the General Manager or a Madison Transit & Parking Commission member.

### Scenario 7: Eliminate Two County Executive Appts., Add Small Cities/Villages Appt., and Add Metro Transit Rep. (General Manager or TPC Chair)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Exec</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>C. &amp; V.</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>NEW 2010 Planning Area Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Cities &amp; Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Under Scenarios 1, 3 and 5, City of Madison Mayor might be required to appoint a representative for Metro Transit as one of his appointments depending upon pending FTA guidelines. That representative could probably be either the General Manager or a Madison Transit & Parking Commission member.
If it is decided to add a 4th representative to the MPO Board from non-Madison cities and villages, an option to consider is having each appointee represent a group of municipalities based on geographic area rather than just having four at-large representatives. Regardless of whether this change is made, another option to consider is weighted voting for the appointments based on the population of each municipality. Below are three different options for groupings of municipalities. There are obviously others. Option 1 is more balanced in terms of the number of municipalities in each group while 2 and 3 are more balanced in terms of total population of the groups.

## Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Fitchburg</td>
<td>25,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/SW C. Verona</td>
<td>10,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Oregon</td>
<td>9,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Fitchburg</td>
<td>25,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/SW C. Verona</td>
<td>10,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,879</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Monona</td>
<td>7,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stoughton</td>
<td>12,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. McFarland</td>
<td>7,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,952</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Option 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Middleton</td>
<td>17,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Cross Plains</td>
<td>3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Shorewood Hills</td>
<td>1,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Maple Bluff</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,858</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Sun Prairie</td>
<td>29,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Cottage Grove</td>
<td>6,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Waunakee</td>
<td>12,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DeForest</td>
<td>8,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,589</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. S/SW</td>
<td>C. Fitchburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SE/E</td>
<td>C. Monona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Stoughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. McFarland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Cottage Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. W/NW + MP</td>
<td>C. Middleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Cross Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Waunakee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Shorewood Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Maple Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. N, NE</td>
<td>C. Sun Prairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. DeForest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: MPO (Transportation Planning Board) Board members

From: Al Matano

Re: Composition of the MPO Board

Date: September 11, 2013

The new boundaries of the MPO have been formed, and the MPO board has been asked to consider whether or not adjustments to the composition of the MPO board are in order. It is my recommendation that the board vote to maintain the status quo.

The current board consists of representatives of the City of Madison, Dane County, other cities and villages within the MPO's boundaries, town government within the MPO's boundaries, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. Since I first joined the MPO board, the Federal Highway Administration changed its rules to require that members of an MPO board be elected officials or transportation professionals. The current board provides a diversity of experience, expertise, geographic residence, and viewpoints. As such, I recommend that the current arrangement be retained.

Dane County's role

A question was raised about the role of Dane County government in terms of regional transportation. Dane County plays several key roles. County representatives were the backbone of the Transport 2020 study, which provided a forum for a key discussion on our transportation future for some 10 years. Former County Board chair Scott McDonell served as co-chair for most of the time of its existence. The County runs the county highway system. The County operates the airport. The County Public Works and Transportation Committee has formed a subcommittee to discuss the future of transit in Dane County. Behind the scenes, county supervisors are seeking to expand transit to communities outside the City of Madison. Dane County representatives have taken leadership roles on the MPO board. And two of the three current Dane County representatives live in a village or smaller city. With merely 3 members out of 14, Dane County should maintain its current representation on the MPO board.

Criteria for determining fair representation

I believe that this is not a situation of "one person, one vote." Moreover, if it were such, the arithmetic is impossible to compute. That concept would not take into account the role of the representatives of Dane County and the Department of Transportation in calculating a numerator and a denominator. Neither entity - 4 of our current 14 board members - fits into a category that can be numerically allocated proportionate to population.

Confluence of interest

It has been suggested that, with the change of boundaries, cities other than Madison and villages are underrepresented. For the reasons stated in the previous paragraph and the next few paragraphs, I dispute that notion. Sun Prairie has over 20,000 citizens. Shorewood Hills has less than 1,000. Cities and villages are diverse in their population, geographic location, and the political leanings of their citizens. Representation based on that level of government does not assure representation proportional to the population of the MPO area.
Al Matano
Composition of the MPO Board
September 11, 2013
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Activity in transportation

The City of Madison and, to a lesser extent, Dane County, play key roles in transportation in the MPO area. Villages and the other cities do not play a leadership role in transportation nor do they expend a great number of dollars on transportation. Representatives of cities and villages tend to be most interested in the actual jurisdiction they live in and where they are an elected or other governmental official.

Experience on the MPO board

With one exception, the Cities and Villages representatives on the MPO board have tended to come and go, with little continuity. While it is good to have representatives of the cities and villages on the board, there is no reason to believe that these representatives will play a key role in the future of the MPO.

"Rural vs. Urban" and future adjustments to jurisdictional boundaries

Additional representatives of cities other than Madison and villages tends to increase the representation of "outlying" areas of the MPO area. Yet at the same time, the urban core of Dane County, and of the MPO area, is an increasing percentage of the area's population. The urban core of Dane County is not restricted to the City of Madison. At least two town governments are slated for dissolution in coming years - the towns of Madison and Blooming Grove. Two villages - Shorewood Hills and Maple Bluff - are completely surrounded by the City of Madison. The MPO boundaries are an explicit attempt to approximate the urban area of the County. While the cities of Middleton, Fitchburg, and Sun Prairie are rapidly becoming part of a contiguous urban core, the idea that "outlying" areas are underrepresented is contradicted somewhat by the urbanizing trend of the County and MPO area's population.

Conclusions - the Board is fine just the way it is

For the reasons stated above, the current composition of the MPO board is proper as currently composed. I recommend against adjusting its boundaries.
Re:
Letter of Comment on Draft Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement on the Beltline (USH 14 to CTH N) Planning and Environmental Linkages Study Process

Staff Comments on Item:
WisDOT and FHWA, the lead agencies for the Madison Beltline Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Corridor Study have prepared and distributed a Draft Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement for review and comment. The plan identifies cooperating and participating agencies and other public stakeholders and outlines the coordination and comment points, concurrence points, and the corridor study milestones. It also establishes a schedule of meetings and time frames for input and review. Major comment points identified include: (1) coordination plan and study goal and objectives; (2) screening criteria; (3) broad strategies and screening; (4) specific corridor concepts and screening; and (5) draft report. An issue resolution process is outlined.

The Coordination Plan is thorough and MPO staff doesn’t have any significant comments on it, but staff wanted to share it with the board. A draft letter has been prepared on behalf of the board thanking WisDOT for the opportunity to comment. The results of the PEL study should provide valuable information for the MPO’s future update of the regional transportation plan and that is noted.

Materials Presented on Item:
1. Letter from WisDOT dated 10/17/13 inviting review and comment on the Draft Coordination Plan for the PEL Study for the Beltline
3. Draft letter of comment on the Coordination Plan.

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:
Staff recommends sending the letter of comment on the Coordination Plan with any additional comments that the board might have on the document.
October 17, 2013

William Schaefer, Transportation Planning Manager  
MPO  
121 S. Pinckney Street, Suite 400  
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Invitation to Review the Draft Coordination Plan

Madison Beltline Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) Corridor Study  
Project ID 5304-02-01  
US 12/14/18/151  
US 14–County N  
Dane County

Dear Mr. Schaefer:

As you know from my May 22, 2013, letter to your agency, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) has initiated a Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) corridor study on the Madison Beltline in Dane County, Wisconsin. The corridor study will address long-term solutions to safety, operational, and capacity concerns on approximately 20 miles of US 12/14/18/151 extending from US 14 (City of Middleton) to County N (Town of Cottage Grove) in Dane County, Wisconsin. The study will consider alternative improvement strategies in the Madison area including capacity expansion, high capacity transit, improvements to existing area alternate routes, and better connections to the north, south, and through the Isthmus.

At the May 30, 2013 Agency Kickoff Meeting for the PEL study, topics discussed included an introduction to the study corridor and area and the PEL process as a way to integrate early planning efforts to help streamline future environmental studies. The use of the PEL approach is consistent with federal legislation. Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), Sec. 1310 provides that “the federal lead agency (FHWA) for a project may adopt and use a planning product in proceedings relating to any class of action in the environmental review process of a project.” Regulations at 23 CFR 450 Planning Assistance and Standards are supportive of MAP-21, Sec. 1310, specifically 23 CFR 450.318 Transportation Planning Studies and Project Development.

In the May 17, 2013, project initiation letter, your agency was invited to become a Cooperating and/or Participating Agency with the FHWA in the development of this PEL corridor study. Please review Table 2-2 beginning on page 12 of the enclosed Draft Coordination Plan to verify if we have the correct information shown for your agency. If you have not yet accepted the invitation to become a Cooperating and/or Participating Agency and would like to do so, please let me know.

On behalf of FHWA and WisDOT, I invite you to review and provide any comments on the Draft Coordination Plan for the PEL process. We would appreciate your comments by November 22, 2013. A second Agency Coordination Meeting will be scheduled soon, and discussion about the Draft Coordination Plan, among other topics, will be on the agenda. You will receive a separate notice of the meeting when the date and location are finalized.
If you would like to discuss the Madison Beltline PEL corridor study or the Draft Coordination Plan in more detail, or if you have any questions on the PEL process or other aspects, please contact me or Bethaney Bacher-Gresock, the FHWA Environmental Project Manager, using the contact information below.

Larry J. Barta  
Project Manager, Planning Unit  
WisDOT Southwest Region—Madison Office  
2101 Wright Street  
Madison, WI 53704-2583  
(608) 246-3884  
Larry.Barta@dot.wi.gov

Bethaney Bacher-Gresock  
Environmental Project Manager  
FHWA-Wisconsin Division  
525 Junction Road, Suite 8000  
Madison, WI 53717 2157  
(608) 662-2119  
Bethaney.Bacher.Gresock@dot.gov

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this study.

Sincerely,

Larry J. Barta  
WisDOT Project Manager

Enclosure: Draft Coordination Plan

cc: Bethaney Bacher-Gresock, FHWA-Wisconsin  
Jenny Grimes, WisDOT Environmental Coordinator  
Joan Petersen, Strand Associates, Inc.
DRAFT
COORDINATION PLAN
for
AGENCY AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
As part of the pilot Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) Corridor Study Process for

US 12/14/18/151
MADISON BELTLINE
US 14 to County N
Dane County
WisDOT Project I.D. 5304-02-01

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Wisconsin
Department of Transportation

October 2013
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Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Coordination Plan

The planning and environmental review processes associated with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require interagency coordination and public involvement prior to final decisions being made or actions taken by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) or the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the joint lead agencies. The purpose of this Coordination Plan for the Madison Beltline Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) Corridor Study is to communicate how and when the lead agencies, WisDOT and FHWA, will coordinate public and agency participation and comment in the planning and environmental review processes for the Madison Beltline PEL corridor study.

The Coordination Plan outlines how the lead agencies have specific responsibilities for compliance with various aspects of the planning and environmental review processes, such as the issuance of invitation letters, and how the lead agencies will provide opportunities for input from the public and other agencies. The Coordination Plan also identifies coordination and comment points, concurrency points, and corridor study milestones. It also establishes a schedule of meetings and time frames for input and review by the cooperating and participating agencies, public stakeholders, Native American tribes of Wisconsin and other interested tribal communities.

This plan will be shared with the federal, state, and local agencies, local units of government, and Native American tribes who have expressed interest in the corridor study. Copies of the draft Coordination Plan will be sent to the interested parties for review and comment. A copy of the completed Coordination Plan will be shared with the public by posting on the study website (www.madisonbeltline.dot.wi.gov). The plan will be updated as necessary to reflect substantive changes to agency contact information (see Table 2-2) or coordination activities, actions or study schedule (see Table 4-1). Changes in law, regulation, or policy are also examples of when a change to the Coordination Plan may be needed. All changes will be documented, and agencies and the public will be notified by posting the revised version of the Coordination Plan on the study website. Paper copies will be available by request from the WisDOT Project Manager and at public information meetings. The Coordination Plan will be available in English or another language, upon request.

This Coordination Plan is prepared and implemented to establish planning and environmental review processes that conform to requirements of the NEPA, Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act (WEPAC), and specifically to comply with Section 1310 Integration of Planning and Environmental Review of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) of 2012 (codified at 23 USC §168) as well as 23 USC §134 Metropolitan Transportation Planning, §135 Statewide Transportation Planning, and §139 Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decisionmaking. The implementing regulations are 23 CFR §450 Planning Assistance and Standards and §771 Environmental Impacts and Related Procedures.

1.2 Corridor Description

The study corridor of the Madison Beltline (US 12) begins at the US 12/14 (University Avenue) interchange in the city of Middleton and extends approximately 20 miles south and east to the US 12/18 and County N interchange in the town of Cottage Grove (see Figure 1-1). Four United States highway routes (US 12, US 14, US 18, and US 151) are partially routed on the Beltline. All four routes are concurrent between the Verona Road (US 18/151) and Park Street (US 14) interchanges. Within the corridor study limits, US 12 passes through the cities of Middleton, Madison, Fitchburg and Monona and the Town of Cottage Grove. Figure 1-1 shows a map of the Madison Beltline and vicinity. The Connections 2030 Long-Range Multimodal Transportation
Plan, adopted October 2009, identifies US 12 as a Connector Route west of Verona Road and east of I-39/90 and a Backbone Route from Verona Road to I-39/90\(^1\).

In addition to serving as a major regional transportation link, the Beltline serves as a local transportation corridor for the communities it passes through. Because of the nature of the geography and development surrounding the Beltline, it is the only continuous east-west route on the south side of Madison. The east-west routes on the north side of the Beltline are severed by the University of Wisconsin Arboretum, Lake Wingra and Lake Monona. The east-west routes on the south side of the Beltline pass through residential neighborhoods and marsh areas and are not continuous. As a result, the Beltline is critical to the mobility of local traffic.

![Madison Beltline PEL Corridor Study Limits](image)

**Figure 1-1  Madison Beltline PEL Corridor Study Limits**

### 1.3 Corridor Study Background
In 2005, WisDOT began a Safety and Operational Needs Assessment that examined the same 20 miles of the Beltline covered by this PEL Study. The Safety and Operational Needs Study was split into three phases and documented in three project reports. The Phase I and II reports were released in 2008. The Phase I report analyzed crashes and traffic volumes and summarized

---

existing and future safety and operational issues along the length of the corridor. It also catalogued the physical features of the roadway and identified structural and geometric standard deficiencies. The Phase II report summarized and prioritized short-term improvements that would address some of the safety and operational issues identified in Phase I. The intent of the Phase II improvements was to extend the useful life of the Beltline by 10 to 15 years without adding capacity. Construction of these improvements began in 2008 and will continue through at least 2014. The Phase III report, released in 2012, examined the viability of additional grade-separated crossings of the Beltline at various locations throughout the corridor. The PEL Study will make use of and build upon the findings documented in the 2008 and 2012 reports.

The PEL Study will begin with an updated assessment of current conditions on the Beltline. The current and future deficiencies, issues and needs will be identified and documented in a problem statement. The goal(s) and objectives for the Beltline will be developed. A variety of strategies that might address the objectives will be developed. Strategies will likely focus on the Beltline and its connections to the adjacent road network, but the study team will also examine the benefits of changes, improvements or additions to the surrounding transportation networks. Other travel modes in the general area will also be analyzed. Extensive coordination with FHWA and other federal and state agencies, Madison area local governments and numerous other stakeholders will be ongoing throughout the study process. Screening criteria will be developed to evaluate the ability of each strategy to address the problem statement and objectives. Only those reasonable strategies and concepts identified in the PEL Study will be carried forward for detailed study in a future environmental impact statement (EIS).

1.4 Agency Coordination Prior to the Development of the Coordination Plan
WisDOT initiated agency contacts with an invitation to participate in this PEL Study of the Beltline. Letters to agencies were mailed as follows:

- Federal agencies: May 17, 2013
- Native American tribes: May 21, 2013
- State agencies: May 22, 2013
- Local municipalities: May 31, 2013

A draft copy of this Coordination Plan was sent to agencies, local municipalities, and Native American tribes on October 11, 2013.

Section 2: Lead, Cooperating, and Participating Agencies

2.1 Agency Definitions and Responsibilities
The standard definitions and responsibilities for each lead, cooperating, and participating agency invited to participate in the planning and environmental review processes for this corridor study are as follows:

**Lead Agency:** USDOT-Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is the federal lead agency and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is the state lead agency for this corridor study. In some instances, a local corridor study sponsor may be identified as a "local lead agency." No local lead agencies have been identified by FHWA and WisDOT for this corridor study. As joint lead agencies, FHWA and WisDOT have responsibilities that include managing the PEL review and documentation process; preparing all study reports and other documents; and providing opportunities for cooperating and participating agency involvement and public involvement.

As the federal lead agency, FHWA will invite other affected or interested federal agencies and Native American tribes to participate in the corridor study’s PEL process. As the state lead agency, WisDOT will invite other affected or interested state and local agencies to participate in the process. WisDOT is also responsible for all aspects of the PEL Study for the Madison Beltline. FHWA must oversee the study process and concur that the process, as implemented by WisDOT, satisfies NEPA and WEPA as well as other applicable laws, regulations, and guidance.
Cooperating Agency: The Council on Environmental Quality defines cooperating agencies as any federal agency other than a lead agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The selection and responsibilities of a cooperating agency are described in 40 CFR § 1501.6. A state or local agency of similar qualifications or, when the effects are on a reservation, a Native American tribe, may by agreement with the lead agency become a cooperating agency (40 CFR 1508.5).

Cooperating agencies will use their knowledge and expertise to assist the lead agencies in identifying issues of concern regarding the project’s potential impacts, and provide meaningful and timely input throughout the environmental review process. Cooperating agencies will also be invited to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The purpose of the MOU is to foster a proactive working relationship between the FHWA, WisDOT, and federal and state environmental agencies and tribes through the PEL process. This cooperation on environmental review and corridor study delivery activities is anticipated to avoid delays and duplication later in the NEPA process, head off potential conflicts, and ensure that planning and corridor study development decisions reflect environmental values. The signatories of the MOU are committed to providing appropriate information and performing meaningful and efficient environmental analyses that are pertinent to the decision-making process on the Madison Beltline PEL Corridor Study.

Agencies invited to be cooperating agencies are listed in Table 2-1.

Participating Agency: Participating agencies include federal, state, or local agencies that have an interest in the corridor study. These agencies agree to identify issues of concern regarding the project’s potential impacts and provide meaningful and timely input on problem statement, objectives, screening criteria, strategy and concept analysis screening, and range of strategies and concepts for the PEL Study.

Agencies invited to be participating agencies are listed in Table 2-1.

2.2 WisDOT-DNR Cooperative Agreement
Wisconsin Statutes establish an alternative process for WisDOT and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) to interact on state transportation projects. State transportation projects are coordinated with and reviewed by WDNR through interdepartmental liaison procedures known as the “WisDOT-DNR Cooperative Agreement.” The agreement, in Chapter 30 of the Wisconsin Statutes (Navigable Waters, Harbors and Navigation), Section 30.2022 (Activities of Department of Transportation)², was first established in 1995 and updated in 2002 and is included in the WisDOT Facilities Development Manual³. The WisDOT-DNR Cooperative Agreement process engages both agencies in progressive discussions and reviews throughout the transportation development process and culminates in a “concurrence letter” from WDNR at the conclusion of final design activities. Coordination with and concurrence from WDNR during this corridor study’s planning and environmental review processes precedes and supplements WDNR’s review and concurrence role during the final design process.

Nothing in this Coordination Plan is designed or intended to replace or supplant the steps, activities or expectations expressed in the WisDOT-DNR Cooperative Agreement, nor does participation in this environmental review process in any way affect WDNR’s need or ability to perform review and provide concurrence during final design activities.

2.3 **List of Agencies, Roles, and Responsibilities**

The intent of coordination with federal, state, and local agencies as well as interested tribes is to cooperatively identify important environmental, social or cultural resources, and potential impacts. It is also the intent to resolve issues that could delay the environmental process or that could result in denial of approvals required to implement a proposed project. A more complete list of agency expectations is included in Section 3.1.

The agencies listed in Table 2-1 have been identified as lead, cooperating and/or participating agencies or potentially interested Native American tribes. All the agencies and tribes noted in the table have been invited by FHWA or WisDOT to be cooperating or participating agencies. Additional agencies can be invited and added to the list of participants at any time, as appropriate.

All the agencies and tribes noted in Table 2-1 have a shared responsibility to provide comment on all aspects of the PEL Study, and this includes providing comments on the problem statement, goal and objectives, range of strategies and concepts, impact screening criteria, strategies and concepts recommended to move forward to the NEPA process, and potential mitigation measures. When the lead, cooperating and participating agencies have specific jurisdiction responsibilities related to the PEL Study, these are also noted in the table.

Invitations were sent to the specific agency contacts listed in Table 2-2. A number of local municipalities responded declining the invitation to become a participating agency but requesting that minutes of meetings be sent to them. As a result, minutes of meetings will be sent to all the local agencies listed in Table 2-2.

**Table 2-1 Lead, Cooperating, and Participating Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Federal lead agency</td>
<td>Oversee PEL process; provide opportunity for public and agency involvement. Approve or concur with Final Report. Perform initial identification of potentially affected properties subject to Section 4(f) and inform agencies with Section 4(f) jurisdiction. (Section 4(f) determinations will not be made in this PEL Study phase.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agency</td>
<td>Clean Water Act Section 404 permit jurisdiction. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agency</td>
<td>NEPA and Clean Water Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Farmland Protection Policy Act and Food Security Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on farmland impact rating and Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Interior (USDOI)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on potential effects to Ice Age Trail. In the event there are potential impacts to other National Historic Landmarks or Section 6(f) properties, reinitiate consultation with NPS contacts with jurisdiction. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service (NPS)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on potential impacts to Native American populations and/or transportation needs. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Interior (USDOI)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Interior (USDOI)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Housing and Economic Recovery Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on government owned low income housing. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide information regarding funding criteria and funding for transit. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (FTA)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td>State lead agency</td>
<td>Manage PEL process, provide opportunity for public and cooperating/participating agency involvement, and prepare Final PEL Corridor Study Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agency</td>
<td>Clean Water Act and DOT-DNR Cooperative Agreement authority. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Region Office – Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 jurisdiction. Review and comment on cultural resource investigation reports/materials. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Authority under Section 32.035, Wisconsin Statutes to prepare an Agricultural Impact Statement if needed in a future NEPA study. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Impact Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Administration – Division of Energy Services</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Administration – Division of Intergovernmental Relations</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>The Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, as the MPO, provides regional coordination and approves use of federal transportation funds within the metropolitan planning area. Responsibility for the implementation of specific transportation projects lies with WisDOT and other local units of government as transportation providers. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC)</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>The function of the Commission is to serve as the regional planning and areawide water quality management planning entity for the Dane County region, consistent with §66.0309, Wis. Stats. and state Administrative Code NR 121. The Commission is charged with the duty of preparing and adopting a master plan for the physical development of the region and maintaining a continuing areawide water quality management planning process in order to manage, protect, and enhance the water resources of the region, including consideration of the relationship of water quality to land and water resources and uses. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities of Fitchburg, Madison, Middleton, Monona, Stoughton, Sun Prairie, Verona</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages of Cottage Grove, McFarland, Oregon, Shorewood Hills, and Waunakee</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns of Blooming Grove, Burke, Cottage Grove, Dunn, Madison, Middleton, Pleasant Springs, Springfield, Verona, Vienna, Westport, Windsor</td>
<td>Participating agency</td>
<td>Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native American Tribes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Tribes:</td>
<td>Participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments and consultation on tribal cultural resources and National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 impacts. Provide comments on all aspects of the PEL Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forest County Potawatomi Community;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ho-Chunk Nation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sac and Fox Nation of the Mississippi in Iowa;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Date Invitation Issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Windsor</td>
<td>Bob Wipperfurth, Chair 4084 Mueller Road DeForest, WI 53532 (608) 846-2703 <a href="mailto:nwipperfurth@windsorwi.gov">nwipperfurth@windsorwi.gov</a> Christine Capstran, Clerk (608) 846-3854 ext. 24 <a href="mailto:Christine@windsorwi.gov">Christine@windsorwi.gov</a></td>
<td>5/31/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of WI</td>
<td>Mike Wiggins, Jr., Chair PO Box 39 Odanah, WI 54861 (715) 682-7121 Edith Leoso, THPO PO Box 39 Odanah, WI 54861 (715) 882-7121</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest County Potawatomi Community of WI</td>
<td>Harold &quot;Gus&quot; Frank, Chair PO Box 340 Crandon, WI 54520 Melissa Cook, THPO PO Box 340 Crandon, WI 54520</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-Chunk Nation</td>
<td>Jon Greendeer, President PO Box 667 405 Airport Road Black River Falls, WI 54615 (715) 284-9343 William Quackenbush, THPO Executive Offices PO Box 867 405 Airport Road Black River Falls, WI 54615 (715) 284-9343</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>James Williams Jr., Chair P.O. Box 249 Watersmeet, MI 49969 (906) 358-4577 gliweglizhigoogkway Martin, THPO Ketegitigaaning Ojibwe Nation P.O. Box 249 Watersmeet, MI 49969 (906) 358-4577</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee Indian Tribe of WI</td>
<td>Craig Corn, Chair PO Box 910 Keshena, WI 54135 (715) 799-5100 David Grignon, THPO PO Box 910 Keshena, WI 54135 (715) 799-5100</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Date Invitation Issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation</td>
<td>Steve Ortiz, Chairman, NHPA Rep. 16281 Q Road Mayetta, KS 66509</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Souller, Chair 88385 Pike Road, Highway 13 Bayfield, WI 54814 (715) 779-3700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Balber, THPO 88385 Pike Road, Highway 13 Bayfield, WI 54814 (715) 779-3700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation of Mississippi in Iowa</td>
<td>Frank Black Cloud, Chair 349 Meswaki Road Tama, IA 52339-9626</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Buffalo, NAGPRA Representative 349 Meswaki Road Tama, IA 52339-9626 (641) 484-4678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Dougherty, Chair 305 North Main Reserve, KS 66434</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmore Green 305 North Main Reserve, KS 66434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma</td>
<td>George Thurman, Principal Chief Route 2, Box 246 Stroud, OK 74079 (918) 968-3526</td>
<td>5/21/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Massey, NAGPRA Representative Route 2, Box 246 Stroud, OK 74079 (918) 968-3526 ext 1048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3: Coordination, Comment and Acceptance/Acknowledgement Points and Responsibilities

3.1 Agency Expectations

Expectations for joint lead agencies:
- Manage and coordinate the study process. Ensure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken.
- Ensure WisDOT's PEL Corridor Study process is followed completely such that the decisions made and information, analysis, and products developed as a result of this PEL process can be incorporated into the NEPA process expected to proceed upon successful completion of this PEL Corridor Study.
- Identify and invite cooperating and participating agencies and encourage their participation.
- Develop the Coordination Plan.
- Develop the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
- Provide, as early as practicable and no later than the appropriate corridor study milestone, accurate and complete corridor study information on the problem statement and objectives,
environmental resources, strategies and concepts and proposed screening criteria. Take such actions as are necessary and proper to facilitate and expedite the study process.

- Provide opportunity for public and agency involvement in defining the problem statement and objectives and determining the range of strategies and concepts; collaborate with cooperating and participating agencies in determining screening criteria and the level of detail for the analysis of strategies and concepts.
- Consult with and involve Native American tribes and communities in compliance with NEPA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), and other planning and environmental laws and regulations.
- Manage and facilitate the process of issue resolution.

**Expectations for cooperating agencies:**

- Assist the lead agencies in identifying environmental, social or cultural resources of concern.
- Identify as early as practicable any issue of concern regarding environmental or socioeconomic impacts of any possible solution that is developed.
- Identify as early as practicable any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the future granting of a permit or other approval needed for a future NEPA document and ultimately a future improvement project.
- Share all other information that may be useful to the FHWA, WisDOT and cooperating and participating agencies.
- Participate in up to five meetings and/or field reviews.
- Assume, at the request of FHWA, responsibility for preparing analysis for which that cooperating agency has special expertise, depending on cooperating agency’s resource availability.
- Make support staff available at the request of the joint lead agencies.
- Provide input on this plan and schedule.
- Provide comments to WisDOT and FHWA at each of five points in the process, as indicated in Table 4-1 of this Coordination Plan, within the time frame indicated therein.
- Participate as needed in issue resolution activities.
- Sign the MOU.

**Expectations for participating agencies:**

- Assist the lead agencies in identifying environmental, social or cultural resources of concern.
- Identify as early as practicable any issue of concern regarding the corridor study environmental or socioeconomic impacts related to potential solutions that are developed.
- Share all other information that may be useful to the FHWA, WisDOT and cooperating and participating agencies.
- Participate in meetings and field reviews as appropriate and invited.
- Provide input on this plan and schedule.
- Provide comments to WisDOT at each of five points in the process, as indicated in Table 4-1 of this coordination plan, within the time frame indicated therein.
- Participate as needed in issue resolution activities.
- Sign the MOU, if a signatory agency.

**3.2 Coordination Activities, Information Requirements, and Responsibilities**

To facilitate public and agency involvement in the planning and environmental review processes for the PEL Corridor Study for the Madison Beltline, a number of coordination and comment points have been established. Coordination points ("check-in" points for one or more activities) occur when corridor study review activities or milestones will result in important decisions affecting the environmental review process and its outcomes. Comment points are occasions in the study process when the lead agencies will request written feedback from cooperating and participating agencies, related to draft documents. The lead agencies will respond to comments, finalize documents, and move forward with the PEL process.
Coordination and comment points will involve exchanges of information and opinions between the lead agencies and cooperating and participating agencies and the public. This information exchange will often be accomplished by mail or email, but it may also occur during face-to-face or public information meetings.

Comment points are anticipated for the following PEL study activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Point 1</th>
<th>Provide written comments on draft documents: PEL Work Plan, Coordination Plan, problem statement, goal, objectives, and MOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial PEL Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Point 2</th>
<th>Provide written comments on development of criteria for screening (that also address social, cultural and environmental resources) of potential corridor solutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Point 3</th>
<th>Provide written comments on identification of the full range of broad corridor strategies and the application of screening criteria (that also address social, cultural and environmental resources) to retain and reject possible strategies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Strategies and Screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Point 4</th>
<th>Provide written comments on analysis of specific corridor concepts and the application of screening criteria (that also address social, cultural and environmental resources) to advance and dismiss corridor concepts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Corridor Concepts and Screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Point 5</th>
<th>Provide written comments on Draft PEL Corridor Study Report (including analysis of further refined corridor concept solutions, application of screening criteria that also address social, cultural and environmental resources, documentation for concept solutions retained and rejected for further study in NEPA documents, and identification of potential mitigation opportunities).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft PEL Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Acceptance/Acknowledgement Point is a written determination by an agency that the information provided to it is adequate to agree that the corridor study can be advanced to a NEPA study. Agencies agree not to revisit the previous process steps and findings unless conditions change.\(^4\) Acceptance/Acknowledgement by an agency does not imply that it supports the corridor study or findings, that it has approved the corridor study or findings, or that the agency has released its obligation to determine whether the fully developed project meets statutory review criteria. As stated above, this point means an agency agrees the findings can be used in a future NEPA study. There is a single Acceptance/Acknowledgement Point in the PEL Corridor Study process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance/ Acknowledgment Point</th>
<th>Written acceptance or acknowledgement of Final PEL Corridor Study Report for incorporation into NEPA documents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEL Products Can Move Forward into NEPA Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Examples of changed conditions could include changes to the corridor study area or new federal or state laws or regulations that would affect the NEPA process.
3.3 Issue Resolution Process
The lead, cooperating and participating agencies will work collaboratively to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the PEL Corridor Study process or that could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

Based on information received from the lead agencies, cooperating and participating agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental, cultural or socioeconomic impacts. Issues of concern include any issues that could substantially delay or prevent future NEPA concurrence, the granting of a permit or other approvals that are needed for a NEPA document or ultimately an improvement project.

Issue resolution will be implemented when there is failure to reach concurrence at a concurrence point or when there is substantial disagreement at a critical decision point. The issue resolution process will be consistent with 23 USC 139(h). It will first consist of an informal attempt to reach concurrence/agreement among cooperating and participating agencies. Participants in issue resolution activities would include a representative of each of the federal agencies and appropriate state agencies. Each agency shall make its best effort to resolve disputes. Since this corridor study is pre-NEPA, the lead agencies may determine that it is appropriate to document the issue and efforts taken to try to resolve them and revisit the issue in the NEPA phase. The lead agencies may also determine that it is appropriate to continue the dispute resolution process, in which case, within 30 days of an agency(ies) identifying nonconcurrency with the Final PEL Corridor Study Report, a dispute resolution meeting of designated agency representatives would be convened.

Dispute resolution meetings will be convened at an agreed upon location and time. At this meeting, an attempt will be made to resolve the concerns of the agency(ies) through consensus. This may include providing information or detail not previously provided. If the concerns are resolved at this meeting, the process is ended and the concurrence is formalized in the agreed-to manner.

The planning and environmental review and documentation processes may continue whether or not attempts to reach concurrence are successful. However, if the dispute remains unresolved, the agency(ies) in nonconcurrency retains the option to elevate its (their) concerns through existing, formalized dispute elevation procedures at the appropriate point in the environmental review or permitting process.

Section 4: PEL Process Steps and Schedule

4.1 Schedule and Time Frames
The major milestones and points of coordination, comment or acceptance are shown as PEL process steps and listed in Table 4-1, along with the type of information provided, actions needed and contacts responsible. All the PEL process steps are initiated by FHWA and WisDOT. The time frames in which the actions are anticipated to occur and the estimated and actual completion dates are also shown in the table.

The estimated time frames listed in the table must be discussed and negotiated with cooperating and participating agencies and should not appear in this table as "final" until affected agencies agree the time frames are appropriate and achievable. By agreeing to the time frames listed below, agencies accept their responsibility to provide appropriate outputs and feedback within the allotted time.
Table 4-1 PEL Process Steps and Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Milestone, Coordination, Comment or Acceptance Point</th>
<th>Information Provided or Action Taken</th>
<th>Who Contacted for Response</th>
<th>Information or Action Requested</th>
<th>Number of Days to Complete Activity</th>
<th>Estimated Date Complete</th>
<th>Actual Date Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies Identified</td>
<td>Letters of invitation to potential federal and state agencies and tribes sent with information on WisDOT PEL Corridor Study Process</td>
<td>Potential federal, state and tribal cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Affirmation of process validity through written acceptance or reason for nonacceptance</td>
<td>&gt; 30 calendar days</td>
<td>9/30/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Municipal briefings</td>
<td>Meetings to provide overview of PEL Study and scope</td>
<td>Representatives from various cities and villages in study area</td>
<td>Meetings held</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>5/8/13; 5/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agency Meeting</td>
<td>Present PEL process, overview of study area, draft MOU, draft problem statement, draft goal and objectives draft Coordination Plan</td>
<td>Potential federal, state and tribal cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on drafts of PEL Work Plan, Coordination Plan, MOU, problem statement and objectives</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5/30/13</td>
<td>5/30/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agency Comment Point 1</td>
<td>If appropriate, provide revised versions of draft PEL Work Plan, draft MOU, draft problem statement, draft goal and objectives and draft Coordination Plan, based on Agency Meeting comments</td>
<td>Potential cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Sign MOU (for signatory agencies) Provide written comments for items in Step 3, above</td>
<td>&gt;30 calendar days after Agency Meeting</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finalized PEL Study Work Plan and Coordination Plan Circulated</td>
<td>Final Work Plan including Coordination Plan</td>
<td>FHWA, cooperating and participating agencies and public via website</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kickoff Public Information Meeting No. 1</td>
<td>Information on PEL Study Work Plan, preliminary existing conditions, draft problem statement, goal and objectives</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, public, local officials and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Comments on information provided</td>
<td>14 calendar days after PIM (typical)</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
<td>9/9/13; 9/10/13; 9/17/13; 9/19/13; 9/23/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Corridor existing conditions summarized, traffic projections developed</td>
<td>Past WisDOT studies and related information</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies and committees</td>
<td>Provide input and assistance relative to agency area of responsibility</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Fall 2013 thru Spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step No.</td>
<td>Milestone, Coordination, Comment or Acceptance Point</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action Taken</td>
<td>Who Contacted for Response</td>
<td>Information or Action Requested</td>
<td>Number of Days to Complete Activity</td>
<td>Estimated Date Complete</td>
<td>Actual Date Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Corridor Conditions Report circulated</td>
<td>Corridor Conditions Report</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies and committees</td>
<td>Review report</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Corridor issues, needs and goals developed</td>
<td>Meetings and outreach with agencies, public, committees, posting on website, mailings, etc.</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, public, committees and interest groups</td>
<td>Provide input on corridor issues, needs and goals</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Broad corridor strategies screening criteria developed</td>
<td>Meetings and outreach with agencies, public, committees, posting on website, mailings, etc.</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, public, committees and interest groups</td>
<td>Provide input on strategies and screening criteria</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agency meeting on needs, issues, goals and screening criteria provided prior to meeting</td>
<td>Draft summary of needs, issues, goals and screening criteria</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide written comments on screening criteria</td>
<td>30 calendar days from date of meeting</td>
<td>Fall 2013/Winter 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Range of broad corridor concepts and strategies developed</td>
<td>Meetings and outreach with agencies and stakeholders, corridor study website, mailings, etc.</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, public, local officials, interest groups and general public</td>
<td>Provide input</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Fall 2013 to Spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Agency meeting on full range of broad corridor concepts or strategies and the screening criteria to dismiss/advance</td>
<td>Draft analysis of broad strategies and retain or reject reasoning</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide written comments on broad strategies and screening recommendations</td>
<td>30 calendar days from date of meeting</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Public Information Meeting No. 2</td>
<td>Information on needs, issues, goals and objectives, and full range of broad corridor concepts or strategies and the screening criteria to dismiss or advance</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, public, local officials and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Comments on information provided</td>
<td>14 calendar days after PIM (typical)</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step No.</td>
<td>Milestone, Coordination, Comment or Acceptance Point</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action Taken</td>
<td>Who Contacted for Response</td>
<td>Information or Action Requested</td>
<td>Number of Days to Complete Activity</td>
<td>Estimated Date Complete</td>
<td>Actual Date Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Make decisions to retain or reject broad strategies</td>
<td>List of broad strategies considered, why kept or discarded, corridor study website</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, general public and stakeholders</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Develop and evaluate specific corridor concepts from the retained broad strategies</td>
<td>Describe corridor concepts, analysis results, impacts information, and mitigation opportunities as developed</td>
<td>Public, committees and cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide data as requested, input and feedback as analysis moves forward</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>Spring and Summer 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Public Information Meeting No. 3</td>
<td>Information on corridor concepts and screening criteria to dismiss or advance</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, public, local officials and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Comments on information provided</td>
<td>14 calendar days after PIM (typical)</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Agency meeting on specific corridor concepts and the screening criteria to dismiss/advance</td>
<td>Draft analysis of specific corridor concepts and retain or reject reasoning</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide written comments on specific corridor concepts and screening recommendations</td>
<td>30 calendar days from date of meeting</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Develop and evaluate refined location specific concepts</td>
<td>Describe refined concepts, analysis results, impacts information and mitigation opportunities as developed</td>
<td>Public, committees and cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide data as requested, input and feedback as analysis moves forward</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>Summer - Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Public Information Meeting No. 4</td>
<td>Information on refined location specific concepts and screening criteria to dismiss or advance</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, public, local officials and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Comments on information provided</td>
<td>14 calendar days after PIM (typical)</td>
<td>Winter 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Draft Corridor Study Report completed</td>
<td>Report findings on all strategies and concepts considered, reasons for dismissed concepts, details on retained concepts, including impacts, mitigation opportunities and high level costs</td>
<td>Public, committees and cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on report findings</td>
<td>60 calendar days from date of PIMs</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 5: Public Involvement

#### 5.1 Public Involvement Process
Public involvement includes engaging key stakeholders, community members and the general public in the planning, design and development of proposed improvements. The general public involvement approach is based on the following objectives:

- Actively seek public input on the corridor's needs, issues, goals and possible solutions and recommended course of action.
- Solicit, consider, answer and document public inquiries, suggestions and ideas in the decision-making process.
- Provide opportunities for the public to affect major decisions before they are made.
- Publicize corridor study activities through a variety of communication venues such as newsletters, news releases, website, Facebook and informational meetings.
- Provide the public with efficient access to corridor study information.

The study team developed a Public Involvement Plan that summarizes the proposed public involvement efforts for the PEL study.

#### 5.2 Identification of Environmental Justice Communities and Outreach
Identification of all potential stakeholders will be an early step in the PEL Corridor Study process. Efforts to identify existing environmental justice (EJ) communities with the potential to be impacted by and/or interested in participating in the study will be guided by the 2010 census results and other information available from local governments in the study area.

The PEL study Public Involvement Plan has a section that describes an overall strategy for identification and outreach to EJ communities and references that a separate EJ outreach plan
was developed for the PEL study. The separate EJ plan details the communication methods and interaction opportunities to be provided with a goal of maximizing EJ community involvement throughout the study process. Involvement by EJ community leaders and their elected representatives in study committees and other public activities will be stressed as a way to improve communications about the study within EJ communities and further improve the community's input in study activities and outcomes.

5.3 Public Involvement in All Phases of the PEL Corridor Study
Involvement by a wide cross section of interested public stakeholders will be a key to the success of the PEL Corridor Study. Table 4-1 of this coordination plan highlights the most significant outreach opportunities and activities. Other interactive opportunities will be offered such as meetings with neighborhood associations and advocacy groups. A list of potential interested stakeholders is provided in the Public Involvement Plan. The timing of interactive opportunities is further defined in the PEL Study Work Plan. Local governments will be asked to assist in efforts to involve their residents and relied upon to provide community insights that may not be obtained any other way.

5.4 Additional Public Involvement Strategies
A Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) consisting of local and special interest representatives will be established and meet on a regular basis. Subcommittees may also be formed if necessary to provide committee opportunities for all that are interested. PAC meetings will be scheduled on an approximately monthly basis beginning in July 2013 and continuing through Step 15 of the PEL process detailed in Table 4-1. At Step 15, the decisions to retain or reject broad strategies are made so that development and evaluation of specific corridor concepts from the retained broad strategies can begin. The PAC will be closely involved with development of the problem statement, goal and objectives and identification and development of broad strategies. See Figure 5-1 for an illustration of anticipated PAC meeting frequency through Step 15 in the PEL process. After Step 15, it is anticipated regular PAC meetings will continue with a frequency to be determined.

PAC members would include but would not be limited to representatives of:

- Locally elected board and council members
- Neighborhood association board members
- Business group representatives
- Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit advocates
- School districts
- Environmental issues groups
- Farming community
- Other interest groups
5.5 Coordination with Local Officials

Local officials' involvement will be sought throughout the study process. Membership on a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be emphasized as a key way to provide input and receive feedback. In general, the committee members will represent specific constituencies and provide technical expertise. Given the large area that will be studied, subcommittees focused on certain aspects or geographic areas are likely to be established to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of this part of the outreach process.

Like the PAC, TAC meetings will be scheduled on an approximately monthly basis through Step 15 of the PEL process as detailed in Table 4-1. Also like the PAC, the TAC will be very involved with development of the problem statement, goal and objectives and identification and development of broad strategies. See Figure 5-1 for an illustration of anticipated TAC meeting frequency through Step 15 in the PEL process. After this point, it is anticipated regular meetings will continue with a frequency to be determined.
TAC members would include but would not be limited to representatives of:

- FHWA
- WisDOT
- Wisconsin DNR
- Dane County
- Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC)
- Madison Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
- City of Madison and all other town, village and city governments (public works, planning, emergency services, sewer & water, etc)
- Madison Metro Sewer & Water
- Madison Metro (transit)

5.6 Availability of Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement

The PEL Coordination Plan will be posted on the WisDOT Beltline Study website: www.madisonbeltline.dot.wi.gov. It will be updated periodically as information on past meetings is added or if substantive changes to other parts of the plan are made.

Section 6: Tribal Involvement and Consultation

The National Environmental Policy Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and the planning and environmental requirements in 23 USC 134, §135, and §139 and 23 CFR 460 and §771 convey responsibilities to the project sponsor and lead agencies for notification and consultation efforts related to environmental, cultural and historic impacts to resources. As a matter of both regulation and policy, it is mandatory to consider tribal interests and concerns related to the proposed undertaking. Effective tribal consultation on resources and issues of interest to the tribes is a necessary and important element of successful projects. Two FHWA websites provide additional resources and links to tribal involvement and consultation guidance documents:

http://www.tribalplanning.fhwa.dot.gov/resources_policy.aspx and


There are two documents that govern working with the tribes on all transportation issues related to WisDOT. One is the WisDOT non-metropolitan local consultation plan that explains the consultation process with FHWA and the tribes. It covers planning and project development. This is called the "Documentation of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's Process for Consultation with Local Officials in Non-Metropolitan Areas." The second document is an agreement to cooperate between FHWA, WisDOT and the eleven tribes. This document is the October 26, 2010 "PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT between Wisconsin's Eleven Federally Recognized Tribes." In addition, WisDOT's Facilities Development Manual, Chapter 26, provides information on coordination with tribes as part of the Section 106 process.

6.1 Tribal Notifications of Proposed Study

As part of the corridor study activities, Native American tribes will be notified about the corridor study problem statement and objectives, strategies and concepts being considered and planned cultural resource investigations and will be asked to provide input on cultural resource (historic properties) aspects to aid in determining the initial Area of Potential Effect (APE). The tribes will also be provided an opportunity to become participating agencies in the study and will be notified about public information meetings.

6.2 Tribal Consultation on Study Area of Potential Effect (APE)

Tribal consultation regarding the corridor study APE will be done as part of item 6.1.

---

November 14, 2013

Larry Barta
WisDOT SW Region—Madison Office
2101 Wright Street
Madison, WI 53704-2583

Re: Draft Coordination Plan
Madison Beltline PEL Corridor Study
Project ID 5304-02-01
USH 12/14/18/151 (USH 14 to CTH N)
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Barta,

In response to your letter of October 17, 2013, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board – A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has reviewed the Draft Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement for the Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Beltline Corridor Study Process and offers the following comments.

The MPO believes that it is a good approach to provide a document that communicates how and when the lead agencies, FHWA and WisDOT, will coordinate and interact with other agencies and the general public in the planning and environmental review processes for the corridor study. The PEL process and the coordination plan for it should help to streamline the EIS process and provide effective project management through coordination and resolution of issues at each phase of the study. This includes development of the study goal and objectives, broad strategies, corridor improvement concepts, refined concepts, and draft and final report. Table 4-1 in the plan is particularly helpful in outlining the study process steps, comment points, and schedule. The MPO finds the Coordination Plan to be very thorough and does not have any significant comments at this time.

The MPO looks forward to working with WisDOT and FHWA on the study as a participating agency, including representation on both the technical and policy advisory committees. The MPO appreciates the presentations that have been made to the full board on the earlier studies of the Beltline focusing on shorter term improvements and looks forward to future presentations on this study as it proceeds.
The results of the PEL study’s evaluation of broad strategies to address the future deficiencies and issues for the Beltline will provide valuable information for the future update of the MPO’s regional transportation plan. Strategies that might not necessarily be deemed to adequately address the problem statement and objectives for the Beltline might nonetheless demonstrate other regional transportation system benefits.

In conclusion, the MPO appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Coordination Plan. If you have any questions, please contact Bill Schaefer, Transportation Planning Manager, at 266-9115 or wschafer@cityofmadison.com.

Sincerely,

Al Matano
Chair, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board